Toronto University Library

Presented by

Royal Astronomical Society

through the Committee formed in

The Old Country

to aid in replacing the loss caused by

The disastrous Fire of February the 14th 1890

Presented with the Chart
to the Royal Astronomical Society
by the Rev. R. Sheepshanks
Nov. 16. 1847

P 1613d

THE

DESCRIPTION AND USE

OF

A NEW CHART OF HISTORY,

EXHIBITING

THE MOST MATERIAL REVOLUTIONS

THAT HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN THE PRINCIPAL

EMPIRES, KINGDOMS, AND STATES:

FROM THE EARLIEST AUTHENTIC RECORDS,

TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE PRESENT YEAR.

By FRANCIS BAILY.

THE THIRD EDITION.

Royal Astronomical Society

LONDON:

SOLD BY JOHN RICHARDSON, ROYAL EXCHANGE; R. HUNTER, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD; AND J. HATCHARD, PICCADILLY.

1817.

1883
21/11/90

Printed by R. and A. Taylor, Shoe-Lane, London.

The size of the Chart, described in the present work, is 40 inches by 26; and it may be had of the publishers either on rollers, or to fold up as a map, or in a single sheet.

	s.	*d.*
The Price, as a single sheet, is	10	0
——————— on canvass	12	6
——————— on canvass and rollers . . .	13	6

No extra charge is made for *colouring*.

Those persons who are desirous of having the Chart on canvass, *to fold up*, should give directions to have it cut through the line which marks the year A. D. 400; and also through the line which separates Portugal from Turkey in Europe.

It is feared that any *smaller* division of the Chart would tend to destroy the connected view of the several countries, which is so necessary to be preserved.

The price of the present *Description and Use of the Chart* is 4*s.* 6*d.* and either the Chart or the Description may be purchased *separately* if required.

For an account of the *Epitome of Universal History*, by the same Author, see the advertisement at the end of this work.

N. B. The years before Christ are distinguished, at the commencement of each article, by the letters B. C. prefixed to the date; and which is supposed to continue until the reader meets with the letters A. D. which denote the years of the Christian æra.

DESCRIPTION AND USE OF THE CHART.

It would be useless, at the present day, to enlarge upon the advantages attending the study of HISTORY; since its *importance* and *utility* are so well known and estimated, that it now forms a necessary and pleasing branch in every system of liberal education. It has, indeed, this powerful recommendation and attraction, that it is not only the best school of philosophy and instruction in our various concerns with the world, but also a source of the highest amusement and pleasure in our more private and domestic hours.

There is perhaps no mode, by which a general *outline* of this science can be so well obtained, as by means of a *Chart of History:* an ingenious contrivance, for facilitating this study, which was originally invented by the French, and introduced into England, about fifty years ago, by Dr. Priestley. The numerous errors, however, with which Dr. Priestley's Chart abounds, have rendered it *totally unfit* for the purposes for which it was intended*. But, in order to preserve and diffuse the advantages of this plan, I some time ago drew up and published a *new* Chart of History; wherein those errors and defects were avoided, and many improvements introduced. A new edition being now called for, I have embraced the opportunity of inserting all the material changes produced by the late extraordinary revolutions in this part of the world.

The great utility and convenience of Charts of this kind

* See some Remarks on Dr. Priestley's Chart, at the end of this work.

have been long acknowledged by those who are in the habit of using them. They afford the same means of information and facility of study in *History*, as Maps do in *Geography*. The latter present the very figure and situation of the country to the eye; and thereby elucidate the description of its rivers, its mountains, and its general features. The former in like manner represent in one view all the principal Revolutions, whether contemporaneous or successive, that have taken place in the different Empires, Kingdoms, and States of the world; and thus serve to explain in a clear and simple manner the most intricate and obscure parts of History, Chronology, and Historical Geography.

It is an unavoidable imperfection of such a chart, however, that it does not make us acquainted with the *internal* history of the countries represented thereon; but only serves to call to mind those revolutions and principal events which are brought about by *foreign* causes, such as conquests, alliances, &c. And although these may have a material effect on the domestic transactions of a state, and evidently influence its history (whereby we are enabled the more easily to recollect the principal chain of events intended to be recorded), yet as many circumstances arising from other sources frequently occur in the history of a country, of equal if not superior importance to any that *can* be represented on the Chart, it becomes necessary to have recourse to some other means of supplying such deficiency.

It is with this view that I have drawn up an *Epitome of Universal History;* or a Chronological Abridgement of the most material events that have taken place in the principal Empires, Kingdoms, and States of the world, from the earliest authentic records down to the present time, in two volumes octavo; and which I intend as an *accompaniment* to the Chart here mentioned. It claims no other merit than as presenting a connected series of events in the histories of the several countries which are inserted in the Chart. By this secondary help, however, the reader will be enabled not only to as-

certain more fully the rise and progress of every state, together with such other circumstances attending its internal history as may be more deserving of notice; but likewise to see more in detail the origin and effect of those revolutions, conquests and alliances, of whose existence he has been already apprised by an inspection of the Chart. He will likewise there find many temporary acquisitions and other circumstances recorded, which are not introduced on the Chart, and which could not be inserted without confusion. The Epitome will supply many apparent defects of this kind; and it was thought best to omit such points on the Chart for the sake of perspicuity, lest, by aiming at too much, the whole object and design of the work might be defeated. As many persons, however, may be desirous of possessing the Chart, without the Epitome above alluded to, I have here inserted an Abstract from it, which contains just enough to enable the reader to follow the several revolutions and changes noticed in the Chart.

In this Abstract, I have been careful to preserve the *dates* of every material event: so that the work may, in some measure, serve as an useful appendage to a system of Chronology; or to more enlarged histories, whose chronology is deficient. These dates are, for the most part, inserted *within parentheses*, in order that they might not interrupt the narration of events by their frequent recurrence: for, in *reading* the history of any particular country, those dates, which are inserted within a parenthesis, may be omitted at pleasure, and considered only as objects of *reference* in case of need. This plan is much better than the ambiguous method of inserting the dates in the margin of the page.

With respect to the Chart itself, it should be understood, that *Time* is supposed to be flowing like a stream from the left hand towards the right; and the whole scale takes in a period of two thousand nine hundred years: namely, from the year B. C. 1000 down to the end of the present century. This interval is divided into twenty-nine equal parts by *per-*

pendicular lines, extending from the top to the bottom; and each of the spaces between these lines is supposed to denote the period of one hundred years. The year in which Christ was born is denoted by a stronger line than the others, for the sake of distinction.

The several countries, whose histories are intended to be delineated, are represented by the *spaces* formed by the *horizontal* lines: and in general, one space will serve to explain the history of each country, from its earliest authentic records down to the present period. Some deviations, however, are occasionally made from this rule; as in England, Germany, France, Switzerland, and some other countries, whose revolutions could not be properly explained without encroaching upon this plan. But whatever space may be appropriated to represent any one country, the same space is uniformly preserved, from one end of the chart to the other, to represent the same country*.

The date, therefore, of any remarkable event in the history of any country, might be readily determined from its position on the chart: for we have only to draw a line across the space appropriated to such country, or insert within it some other character at pleasure, at the proper portion of the century in which the event happened, and the same is immediately represented to the eye more forcibly with respect to time, place, and circumstance, than it could be in any other manner.

Before, however, I proceed to show the utility and convenience of a chart of this kind, I shall explain some other circumstances connected with its construction, which ought

* The whole chart was originally divided into 140 horizontal equal spaces: and a list of the different countries intended to be represented by each (in the order that they are placed on the chart) may be seen in page 17. Many of the spaces, it will be seen by an inspection of the chart occasionally merge into one large space; whilst some, on the other hand, are subdivided into smaller spaces, according to the circumstances of the case. The cause of this will sufficiently appear in the sequel.

previously to be known. In the first place, the *dotted* line is, in all cases, intended to denote *uncertainty:*—when it is placed *perpendicularly*, it denotes uncertainty with respect to the *date;* and when it is placed *horizontally*, it denotes uncertainty with respect to the *boundaries* of the two contiguous states. The full unbroken line, on the contrary, denotes, in all cases, absolute certainty. Secondly, the *broken* line, when placed *perpendicularly*, denotes that the revolution was effected peaceably and without bloodshed; that is, by marriage, by succession, or by consent of the nation; in opposition to the full, unbroken perpendicular line, which always implies conquest and violence, as well as certainty: and when such broken line is placed *horizontally*, it shows that one of the two contiguous states was dependent on the other. Thirdly, the *waved* lines denote a spirit of rivalship between contending princes; during which period, the country may generally be considered in a state of anarchy and confusion. Fourthly, although the position of any of these lines on the chart would point out nearly the time in which the events happened, yet in order to show the exact date of any occurrence, the precise portion of the century elapsed is fixed thereto; and is denoted by the small numerical *figures* annexed to the several lines above alluded to.

This being understood, if a person will carry his eye *horizontally* along the chart, he will see all the principal revolutions which any particular state has undergone, from the earliest period down to the present time: the conquests which have been made in it, and the dynasties which have been established there; together with the order and manner in which they have succeeded each other. And all this will be effected much sooner, as well as more intelligibly and more exactly, than by a long course of reading. For, as in Geography, the description of a country, with respect to the position of its rivers, its mountains, its provinces, and its towns within itself, as well as its general situation in relation to the neighbouring states, receives the highest assistance from the use of maps, and would

be scarcely intelligible without their aid; so likewise, with respect to History, are we enabled by means of a similar contrivance to represent to the eye the most material revolutions that have taken place in the world, and thereby to impress them more forcibly on the mind, as well as more permanently on the memory, than can possibly be done by any written or verbal description.

It has been stated by a writer on this subject, that a more perfect knowledge of history may be gained by an *hour's* inspection of a chart of this kind, than could be acquired by the reading of several *weeks*. But I believe I may be warranted in asserting, that a better idea of the outlines of general history, chronology, and historical geography may be obtained by such an inspection, than could *possibly* be acquired by the reading of many *years*. And (what is of still greater importance) the idea, when thus impressed upon the mind, is much more durable than when obtained by any other method hitherto known.

In order to show this, as well as to explain the principles of the chart, I shall take the history of our own country: and if the reader will follow me, with the chart in his hand, he will in a few minutes comprehend the whole formation and design of it. The uppermost space represents Ireland; the next, Scotland; and the eight next, which extend as far as the dark line, represent England and Wales. We find then, by carrying our eye *horizontally* along the top of the chart, that *England* and *Wales* were inhabited, prior to the Christian æra, by a race of people called Britons; whilst *Ireland* and *Scotland* were independent of it. In the first century of the Christian æra, the Romans conquered Britain: the first invasion took place A. D. 43, and the conquest was completed in 79*. They left it in 410; and, as this was done

* This is represented by a *slant* line: and the two dates, affixed thereto, show the commencement and the end of the enterprise. It was effected by Agricola, who reduced also a part of *Scotland*. In the year 121 Adrian relinquished these northern conquests, and built a wall

voluntarily, the event is denoted by a perpendicular *broken* line. The Britons, being thus left to themselves, were soon after reduced by the Saxons; who, arriving at different times and landing at different places, formed seven distinct kingdoms in this country, which collectively are called the *Saxon Heptarchy.* The first, in the order of time, was the kingdom of *Kent;* which was established in 455. The kingdom of *Sussex* was next; which commenced in 477, but was not established till the year 490. The kingdom of *Wessex* began in 495; and after a war of twenty-four years was established in 519. The kingdom of East Saxons, or *Essex,* was founded in 527; which was chiefly dismembered from the kingdom of Kent. The kingdom of *East Anglia* was erected in 575; and that of *Mercia* in 585. The kindom of *Bernicia* (which included a part of Scotland) may be said to begin in 547; and the kingdom of *Deira* in 562. These two last states were united in the year 590; and formed the powerful kingdom of *Northumberland.* In consequence of these encroachments, the ancient Britons were confined to the principality of *Wales.* These seven kingdoms formed what is called the *Saxon Heptarchy:* but the four small kingdoms of East Anglia, Essex, Kent, and Sussex, soon fell into a state of imbecility and subjection to their more powerful neighbours*; and the dominion of the country appears to have been divided between the three flourishing kingdoms of Northumberland, Mercia, and Wessex.

The whole of England was reduced under one head by

as the boundary of his empire. Lollius, in 140, extended the confines again as far as the wall of Agricola: but Severus, although he is said to have conquered the whole of Scotland in 209, adhered to the boundary of Adrian. These events will be found represented on the chart, with the several dates affixed to the line which is supposed to mark the boundary of England and Scotland.

* The kingdom of Sussex was reduced by the king of Wessex in 686; and the kingdom of East Anglia by the king of Mercia in 792; as appears by an inspection of the chart.

Egbert, king of Wessex, in 827*; who suffered, however, the kingdoms of Northumberland and Mercia to continue as tributary states under him; and this event is consequently denoted by horizontal *broken* lines†. In 866 the *Danes* invaded this country; and although they conquered the whole of it by the year 878 ‡, yet in two years afterwards the Saxons regained their dominion. Nevertheless they suffered the Danes to settle in the northern provinces: but these were finally reduced in 952. Towards the latter end of the tenth century the Danes again invaded England: but as the date of their first invasion is uncertain, it is denoted by a *dotted* line. They conquered the whole country by the year 1013; and kept possession of it till the year 1041, when the *Saxon* line was peaceably restored. In the year 1066 this country was reduced by the *Normans*, under William the Conqueror; from whom are descended all the succeeding monarchs on the English throne. *Ireland* (which during the ninth century had been invaded by the Danes) was conquered by the English in 1172; and *Wales* in 1283. *Scotland* also was reduced by the English in 1296§: but they were driven out again by the Scots, who afterwards made a temporary conquest of Ireland‖. In 1603 James V of Scotland succeeded to the throne of

* He began his conquests in 823, and finished them in 827. This event is represented by a *slant* line, as before mentioned.

† The kingdoms of Essex and Kent were also separated from the monarchy in 836; but were united again in 860.

‡ They had conquered the northern part by the year 874.

§ About the beginning of the fifth century we find the inhabitants of that country divided into *Scots* and *Picts;* but the latter were reduced by Kenneth II in 841. In the year 945, Cumberland was ceded to the king of Scotland; and in 960 he also obtained from the English all the country lying on the north of the Tweed. Northumberland was seized by the Scotch in 1138; who retained it till the year 1156, when they relinquished all their possessions in England. These revolutions may be readily traced on the chart.

‖ These operations were carried on from 1306 to 1315; and the Scotch were driven out of Ireland in 1318.

England: and the whole of the British possessions have ever since been under the dominion of his descendants; if we except the period of king Charles's exclusion from the throne, which extended from 1649 to 1660.

This short sketch will tend to show *how* the principal revolutions in any particular country may be represented by means of a chart of this kind. And I should recommend the reader to go through the whole chart in the same manner by the help of the Abstract at the end of this work: which will take up very little time or trouble. If then he will carry his eye *vertically* from the top to the bottom of the chart, "he will see the contemporary state of all the empires subsisting in the world at any particular time. He may observe which were then rising, which were flourishing, and which were upon the decline. Casting his eye a little on each side of the vertical line, he will see what empires had lately gone off the stage, and which were about to come on. This view is peculiarly pleasing, at the time that we are studying any particular history: for, when we are contemplating what was doing in any one part of the world, we cannot help wishing to know what was carrying on in other parts at the same time; and by no other means can this knowledge be gained so completely, and in so short a time." In order to exemplify this, let us take the æra of the Norman conquest in *England*. We shall find, by an inspection of the chart, that at that period *Ireland*, *Scotland* and *Wales* were quite independent of this country. That *Denmark*, *Norway* and *Sweden* were each governed, and long after continued to be governed, by their respective monarchs, whilst the rest of the northern states were in a very divided and confused condition. That a portion of the vast empire of *Russia* was subject to the dominion of sovereigns who bore the appellation of dukes; whilst the kings of *Poland* had established their power and independence. That *Bohemia* and *Hungary* had likewise chosen kings of their own, and long continued separate nations. That the several states in *Germany*, which about two centuries before

had been incorporated with France, were now united under the dominion of the emperors; whilst the various provinces in the *Netherlands* were still governed by their respective counts or earls. That the once extensive kingdom of *France* was reduced to very narrow limits by the encroachments of the nobles, who had established a number of petty sovereignties in the country; whilst the southern parts, together with *Switzerland*, had been recently claimed and possessed by the Germans, who disputed likewise with the Pontiffs the possession of the *North of Italy*. That the temporal power of the Popes had been long confirmed by their dominion over the *Ecclesiastical States* in the middle of that peninsula; whilst the Normans were just establishing themselves in the south, by subverting the several principalities which had so long subsisted in *Naples* and *Sicily*. That *Navarre*, *Arragon*, and *Castile* were separate and independent kingdoms in *Spain*, and continued so with little interruption for many centuries; whilst the remaining part of that country was a prey to the intestine divisions and civil commotions of the several Mohammedan states established there*. That the *Greek empire* still extended over Turkey in Europe. That the dominions which form the vast empire of *China* were divided into several sovereignties. That the Seljuks and Gasnevids had established themselves in the northern parts of *Hindostân;* whilst the history of the remainder of that fertile country is uninteresting or unknown. That *Persia* had just been conquered by the Seljukian Tatars, who soon after invaded Asia Minor. That the once powerful and extensive empire of the Caliphs was reduced to the narrow limits of the city and environs of *Bagdad*. That the Fatemites for above a century had held possession not only of *Syria* and *Palestine*, but also of the contiguous kingdom of *Egypt*. That the expiring empire of the Greeks in *Asia Minor* still subsisted, but was soon afterwards destroyed by the Seljuks. And that, in

* Represented by the *waved* lines above alluded to.

the western provinces of the north of *Africa*, the Almoravids (a fanatic sect of Mohammedans) had subdued the former possessors of that country.

It has been justly remarked by Dr. Watts, in his celebrated Treatise on *The Improvement of the Mind*, that brief abstracts of history and chronology, and schemes of any of the arts and sciences, formed into tables, and hung up in our studies or usual places of resort, tend more to fix those subjects in our memory than a hundred times reading over the same things in any books. This fact I can most fully confirm, not only by my own evidence, but also by that of many other persons who have pursued the same method. Indeed, so strongly is the general outline of history and chronology impressed upon the memory by means of a chart (of the kind here alluded to) that, after a person has once gone through it, he will for many years retain a lively image of the most material revolutions that have taken place in the world; even though he should neglect to refresh his memory by any subsequent inspection of it. In this manner, it becomes a sort of *Artificial Memory*.

In order to be more fully convinced of the accuracy of this remark, let any person, for a moment, turn his eyes towards the chart, and observe the rise and progress of any of the principal states that have made a figure in the world. Let him take the case of the *Roman Empire* (for instance), whose history is to us the most important in its results of any that could be selected. From the foundation of the imperial city in B. C. 753 to the year B. C. 396, an interval of three hundred and fifty-seven years, it appears that the Romans had not extended their conquests beyond the territories of *Latium*. The reduction of the *Veii* in 396 was the prelude to future victories. The *Campani* submitted in 339, the *Samnites* in 290, and the *Tarentini* in 272: and thus the Romans became possessed of all the southern provinces of Italy. They afterwards pursued their conquests in the north; and by the reduction of the *Cisalpine Gauls* in 222 they became masters

of the whole of Italy to the very foot of the Alps. During the second Punic war they extended their conquests into *Spain;* and by the year 205 had wrested a considerable portion of that peninsula from the dominion of the Carthaginians. During the third Punic war, they carried their arms into *Africa* and into *Greece:* and the year 146 is equally memorable, not only for the destruction of Corinth, and the consequent submission of all the Grecian states, but likewise for the overthrow of Carthage and its expiring empire. Their conquests in the peninsula were continued; and by the year 133 the Romans had reduced the whole of the present kingdom of *Spain.* They next invaded Asia; and not only annexed a considerable portion of *Asia Minor* to their empire, but likewise rendered the several sovereignties that existed there subservient to their power. In the year B. C. 58 Julius Cæsar conquered the *Helvetii;* and two years after this, he subdued the whole of *Gaul.* His successors extended the boundaries of the empire not only in *Asia* and *Africa,* but likewise in Europe by the reduction of *Britain* and part of *Germany.* For many centuries this vast extent of territory continued firmly united, and subject to the same line of emperors. A fatal policy, however, in the administration of government, joined to a general dissoluteness of manners, led eventually to the overthrow of this immense fabric. Various warlike nations and tribes that inhabited the interior of Germany (but who had served in the Roman armies, and acquired a taste for civilized life,) seized upon the fairest provinces in France and Spain; established independent kingdoms there; and introduced a new set of laws and customs into those countries, which has had a material effect upon the civil institutions of all the states of Europe. The *Alemanni* settled in part of Switzerland about the year A. D. 400. The *Burgundi* seized upon the remaining part, together with some of the contiguous provinces of Gaul, in 413. The *Visigoths* in 412 had reduced the southern states of Gaul; and both these nations afterwards enlarged their dominions by successive con-

quests. The *Suevi* invaded Spain in 409; whilst the *Franks* on the northern side of Gaul carried on a destructive war against the Romans, and by degrees eventually succeeded in obtaining possession of nearly the whole of what is now called France. The Roman empire being thus again reduced to the narrow confines of Italy (for the *Greek* empire had been some years completely independent of it) was at length finally overturned by the *Heruli* in 476; who thus extinguished the very name of Roman emperor, and sealed the destruction of the Western Empire.

Now, all these events will be found on the Chart so accurately delineated, both as to *time* and *place*, and will form so perfect a *picture* to the eye, that the whole history may, by inspection, be readily brought again to our recollection without fatigue or labour: and, in this manner, we may trace the principal revolutions that have occurred in any other state or kingdom; the method of doing which will be sufficiently evident, from the numerous instances that have been already adduced*.

I have already observed that the reader will find many temporary acquisitions and other circumstances recorded in the Epitome above mentioned, or even in the present Abstract, which could not be introduced on the Chart without confusion. The possessor of the chart may however easily

* The history of particular *periods*, as well as that of particular *countries*, is capable of being greatly elucidated by means of *detached* and *separate* charts of those subjects; which the reader may easily draw up for his own use, upon the principles already laid down. In such *enlarged* charts we may introduce greater accuracy, both as to *time* and *place*, than can possibly be done on the present scale: and in this manner we may render familiar to the eye any particular portion of history to which we may be desirous of paying more particular attention: such as the history of the *Jews* prior to their captivity, the history of the *Peloponnesian war*, the history of the Saxon *Heptarchy*, the history of *France* during the middle ages, the history of the *West Indies*, and the like. Such a practice will tend very much to impress these events on the memory.

introduce with his pen such parts as he may think more worthy of being retained; or he may insert any arbitrary characters on the chart, for the purpose of calling to mind any remarkable circumstances which he is more particularly desirous of remembering. Such artificial contrivances are oftentimes of great assistance to the *memory*; and are indeed the principal foundation of all the schemes which have been suggested for improving that singular faculty of the mind*.

In the *arrangement*† of the countries on the chart, I have generally commenced with the most northerly ones, and proceeded regularly towards the south, bearing rather to the westward. This, however, must be taken with many exceptions; for it oftentimes unavoidably happens that adjoining states cannot be so contiguously placed on the chart. Wherever it *could* be done, that method has always been preferred; but it will be readily seen that such a mode could not be universally adopted. This, in some cases, may give rise to a separation of the parts of an empire, and it may not be presented to the eye of the reader with that *unity* which the

* Something of this kind I have attempted in the history of the Franks, where the four divisions of the monarchy, on the death of Clovis in 511, are distinguished by faint lines. In the history of the Roman Empire also, on a line with the space which exhibits the province of Thrace, I have inserted a character which is intended to represent the date of the foundation of Constantinople, A.D. 324. Other cases of a similar kind might have been introduced: but I have purposely avoided them lest by crowding the chart, I should render it too confused. The *extended line*, however, in the early history of Rome, which exhibits the duration of the Republic, will show that such aids may frequently be introduced with very good effect. We may sometimes even mark out the period when any remarkable *person* flourished, as I have done (for the sake of an example) in the history of China, where the birth and death of Confucius, the celebrated legislator, are expressed by a line which extends from B. C. 552 to 479. But the insertion of such things should be left to the reader himself.

† The exact order of this arrangement may be seen in page 17: and, in order to preserve an uniformity in the plan, I have pursued nearly the same arrangement in the following Abstract.

subject requires. However, there are few divisions of this kind; and the present arrangement (which has been the result of many repeated trials, and consequently of much labour,) is the best which I have been able to adopt. It is certainly preferable to that which has been pursued by Dr. Priestley, who, in defiance of every principle of geography, has placed the most northerly states at the *bottom* of his chart; by which inverse method of proceeding he has not only subverted the natural position of the countries, but likewise the mode of reading and tracing the histories of the several states.

Great Britain is, for many obvious reasons, placed at the head of the chart. Its history is more interesting to us than that of any other country; and being by its insular situation cut off from the other states of *Europe*, it is in like manner placed by itself, that it should not derange the order of the countries on the continent. Denmark comes next; not as being the most northerly kingdom of Europe, for in this respect it must of course give place to Norway and Sweden; but, as the kings of Norway were occasionally kings also of Sweden, and as part of the Swedish dominions have been lately reduced by Russia, it was necessary that these latter countries should be placed close to each other. A similar reason may be given for many other slight deviations of this kind. They are not likely to mislead the reader, since it is presumed that every one who inspects the chart is conversant with the common principles of geography.

Next to Russia I have given an account of Poland, Prussia, Bohemia, Hungary, Germany, Netherlands, France, and Switzerland. Then, proceeding down the peninsula of Italy, I have described the several states nearly according to their geographical position; and have finished the history of the western provinces of Europe by an account of Spain and Portugal. The subject is resumed on the eastern shores of the Adriatic; and the countries to the south of the Saave and Danube are next in succession. This district includes the

ancient Illyrian, Bulgarian, Thracian, and Grecian states; greatest part of which are now in the possession of the Turks.

I have, from motives which it is unnecessary here to explain, entered *Asia* at its most eastern extremity; and, having given the history of the vast empire of China, together with that of some of its tributary states, I proceed to that of Tatary and Hindostân. The contiguous state of Persia would appear the most proper to be given next (Siberia having, for very obvious reasons, been included in the history of Russia); but in no part of the chart can Arabia be so well introduced as at this place: I have not hesitated, therefore, to insert it here. By this arrangement, the adjoining states of Persia, Assyria, Babylonia, Syria, and Palestine are presented in a more connected form to the eye of the reader. The account of Asia Minor comes next; a country which (though now only a small part of a more extended empire) was formerly the seat of many powerful monarchies.

Having finished the history of Europe and Asia, I proceed to that of *Africa;* commencing with the ancient and celebrated kingdom of Egypt, and proceeding regularly, along the northern coast, to the most western extremity. The southern parts of that immense continent are unhappily still plunged in the grossest ignorance and barbarism; and the inhabitants have not sufficiently distinguished themselves to be deserving of a place in a general history of this kind.

The arrangement of the various states in *America* will be easily understood, from what has been already laid down.

The following table will show the several countries whose histories are delineated on the Chart; in the order in which they are there placed: which will enable the reader to find out the more easily any particular country whose history he is desirous of tracing.

Great Britain.

1 Ireland
2 Scotland
3–9 England
10 Wales

Northern Crowns.

11 Sleswick
12 Denmark
13 Norway
14 Sweden
15 Finland
16 Livonia &c.
17 Siberia
18 Kipjâk
19 Russia
20 Crim Tatary
21 Ukraine
22 Lithuania
23, 24 Poland
25 Prussia

Germany.

26 Bohemia
27 Hungary
28–32 Germany

Netherlands.

33 Utrecht &c
34 Zutphen &c
35 Holland
36 Hainault
37 Flanders
38 Brabant
39 Luxemburg

France.

40 Lorrain
41 Alsace
42 Bretagne
43–45 France
46 Normandy
47 Anjou & Maine
48, 49 Aquitain &c
50 d. of Burgundy
51 e. of Burgundy
52 Dauphiné
53 Provence

Switz.

54, 55 Switzerland

Italy.

56 Savoy & Piedmont
57 Genoa
58 Venice
59 Modena
60 Mantua
61 Milan
62 Parma & Placentia
63 Tuscany
64 Urbino
65 Ferrara &c.
66 Rome
67–69 Naples
70 Sicily

71 Navarre	Spain.	105 Korasân
72 Arragon		106 } Persia
73 Leon		107 }
74 Castile		108 Assyria
75 Cordova &c.		109 Babylonia
76 Granada		110 Syria
77 Portugal		111 Phœnicia
78 Dalmatia	Turkey in Europe.	112 Israel
79 Bulgaria		113 Judah
80 Epirus		114 Armenia Major
81 Ætolia		115 Armenia Minor
82 Thrace		116 Pontus
83 Macedon		117 Cappadocia
84 Bœotia		118 Bithynia
85 Athens		119 Lydia
86 Sparta		120 Phrygia
87 Achaia		121 Cilicia
88 Crete		122 Rhodes
89 Korea	China.	123 Cyprus
90 Leautong		124 Egypt
91 Mantchew Tatary		125 Cyrenaica
92 } China		126 Tunis &c.
93 }		127 Algiers
94 Hya		128 Morocco
95 Thibet		129 Canada
96 Great Tatary	Tatary.	130 Nova Scotia
97 Little Tatary		131 New England
98 Candahar	Hindostan.	132 Pennsylv. & N.Yk.
99 }		133 Maryland & Virgin.
100 } India proper		134 Carolina & Georgia
101 }		135 Louisiana
102 } Decan		136 Florida
103 }		137 Mexico
104 Arabia.	Arab.	138 Peru & Chili
		139 Brazils
		140 Guiana

Persia. Turkey in Asia. Africa. America.

It unavoidably happens in a chart of this kind, that owing to conquests and other acquisitions, the several parts of which a kingdom or state is composed cannot always be placed in a contiguous position; and the eye, therefore, may not always readily perceive the whole extent of such kingdom and its dependencies. Thus, the dominions of the British in France, which continued near 500 years, could not be placed contiguous to England without deranging the whole plan of the chart; which would have been more than counterbalanced by inconveniences of another kind. Neither could the various conquests of the Germans in the Netherlands, in France, and in Italy, be conveniently placed together. Under these circumstances, recourse has been had to *colouring* the different parts of the same empire; by which means the eye can embrace, at one view, the various acquisitions that have been made by the parent state. This, however, has been done sparingly, lest it might introduce confusion instead of adding to the means of information; and it may easily be extended by the possessor of the chart himself, should he think such a measure necessary*. The colours which are fit for this purpose are so few, that a repetition of some of them has been found necessary; but they are such as are not likely to mislead. Thus the red, which marks the Macedonian empire, cannot well be confounded with the red which distinguishes the French nation. Neither can the yellow, which represents the Assyrian empire, be confounded with the yellow that marks the empire of the Saracens; nor can either of these latter be confounded with the yellow that distinguishes the dominions of the Turks; since neither of these three powers were existing *at the same period*.

It will be readily seen that the spaces, which represent the several countries on the chart, do not give any idea of the *extent* of those countries, but merely of the revolutions which they have undergone. "It is necessary to divide some countries,

* Should any person be desirous of colouring the charts in his own manner, he may obtain them *plain* of the publishers.

of no great extent, but in which small states of great fame have arisen (as Greece and Italy), into a considerable number of parts, represented by spaces bounded by parallel lines, which must be continued through the whole length of the chart, every where representing the same spot of ground. But, if a proportionate width were allowed for other regions barren of events, such as Tatary, Siberia, and part of America, the chart would hvae been immoderately large, and the face of it would have exhibited little more than an uniform blank. It must be supposed, therefore, that the person who makes use of this chart has a competent knowledge of geography, and that he is able to form an estimate of the real extent of empires from thence. It is only a certain number of advantages which the utmost ingenuity of man can unite in any one scheme; and by attempting more than is easily practicable, and perfectly consistent, we sometimes spoil the whole. It is evidently, therefore, more prudent to make sure of doing something effectually, than to hazard the doing nothing at all."

When two countries have become united under one head, either by marriage, treaty, or succession, the history of the minor state during such union has always been discontinued, and has been suffered to merge in that of the larger one. Thus, when the duke of Lithuania, in 1386, became king of Poland, the separate history of that province is discontinued on the chart, as if it were an acquisition to the crown of Poland; and when James VI, king of Scotland, succeeded in 1603 to the throne of England, the separate history of the former kingdom is discontinued on the chart, as if the dynasty had become extinct. "For, notwithstanding a small country may give a king to a larger one; yet, unless it retain the seat of empire, it becomes in fact nothing more than a province of the other."

The reader who is acquainted with the plan and execution of Dr. Priestley's Chart, will readily see that I have introduced (on my chart) many considerable improvements and alterations. For, independent of a better arrangement and choice of coun-

tries, I have separated the leading empires and states by strong *dark* lines; whereby the eye is carried from one side of the chart to the other with less confusion; and the reader can thus more easily distinguish the successive possessors of such states. In the conquest of a country likewise, by one or more foreign powers, I have generally allotted to the conquerors, such a portion of territory as more nearly coincides with the fact. Thus, in the establishment of the Saxon Heptarchy in England, I have made the kingdoms of Northumberland, Mercia, and Wessex, much larger than the four other kingdoms, which were dependent on the former ones. Their situation on the chart agrees likewise as near as possible with their geographical position. This method certainly gives us a better idea of the relative situation and extent of those states, than that which has been adopted by Dr. Priestley; who, without any attention to these particulars, has assumed them all of an uniform magnitude. Moreover, many dynasties he has represented as *successive*, which were in fact frequently *contemporary*. Thus, the Normans in Italy are represented as having established themselves *at once* by the reduction of the Greeks and Saracens, in 1043. But they had established themselves there ever since the year 1029; and for many years disputed with those powers the sovereignty of the southern parts of that peninsula. These are points which can easily be delineated on the chart, and constitute its principal advantage and most striking feature.

I shall not however enter any further into an explanation of this subject: conceiving that if the student will read through the following Abstract, with the chart by his side, he will fully and readily understand the principles here laid down, and the object and design of the work.

ABSTRACT

OF

HISTORY.

IRELAND.

The Irish pretend to great antiquity: but their history is involved in much obscurity. Christianity was introduced into this island about the middle of the fifth century, by St. Patrick, their tutelar saint: but their condition does not appear to have been mended by this event. Ireland seems to have been divided into a number of petty states, till the invasion of the Danes under Turgesius, in A. D. 815; and who was proclaimed monarch of the whole island in 845. The new king proved such a tyrant that he was soon deposed, and the Danes were massacred or dispersed. Henry II taking advantage of the unsettled state of the country, landed an army there in 1172; and, in the course of one year, entirely reduced it to his subjection. The condition of the Irish was not bettered by this conquest; and the country was still, for many years, the scene of rapine and disorder. Robert Bruce, king of Scotland, took advantage of these commotions, and overran the whole island (1315): but his army was at length defeated at Dundalk, and obliged to leave the country (1318). It has ever since remained in the hands of the English: and on the 1st of January 1801, after considerable opposition, the two countries were united under the same government.

SCOTLAND.

This part of the island of Great Britain was anciently called Caledonia; and the inhabitants were of Celtic origin. The most authentic accounts of its early history are collected from the Roman authors. After the reduction of England, Agricola penetrated into the northern parts, and in his second campaign conquered all the country to the south of the Forth and Clyde (A. D. 79), which he secured by a wall extending across the neck of land which separates the friths of Forth and Clyde. How long the Romans kept possession of this part of the country is uncertain; but we know that in 121 Adrian relinquished the whole of it, having built another wall from the Solway Frith to the river Tyne, as the boundary of the empire. Lollius, governor of Britain in the reign of Antoninus Pius, extended the boundaries again as far as the wall of Agricola (140); the emperor Severus afterwards penetrated into the country with a large army; yet, though he reduced all Scotland to submission (209), he adhered to the boundary of Adrian. In 368 Valentinian extended the boundaries of the empire once more to the wall of Antoninus Pius.

Soon after the Romans quitted this island (410), the Scots regained possession of all that is now called Scotland. About this time we find the natives distinguished into *Scots* and *Picts:* but the latter were eventually subdued by Kenneth (841), who thereby united the whole country under one monarchy. In 945, Edmund, having subdued Cumberland from the Britons, gave it to Malcolm king of Scotland; and in 960 Indulf obtained a formal cession from the English of all the country which they possessed to the north of the Tweed. In 1138 David king of Scotland entered and seized upon Northumberland, which was given to prince Henry, afterwards Henry II; who bestowed it, together with Westmoreland and Durham, upon David: and these four northern counties remained united to Scotland till Henry II recovered them from Malcolm IV (1156).

Upon the death of Alexander III the last male branch of the ancient kings of Scotland (1286), two principal competitors for the crown appeared, John Baliol and Robert Bruce. Edward I, king of England, taking advantage of these disputes assumed the reins of government himself (1296). The repeated efforts of Edward were however baffled by the heroic valour of Sir William Wallace and Robert Bruce; the latter of whom, being the grandson of Baliol's competitor, established himself on the throne (1306); and soon after, at the battle of Bannockburn, finally expelled the English (1314). Robert next attempted the reduction of Ireland: but, after having overrun the greatest part of the country, and after being absolutely crowned there, he was obliged to retire without making any conquest (1318).

James VI, the son of the unfortunate Mary, was proclaimed king after her resignation in 1567, and succeeded to the crown of England on the death of Queen Elizabeth (1603). In consequence of which, these two countries have been henceforth governed by one and the same monarch; and this connection was rendered perpetual by the *union* of the two kingdoms in 1706.

ENGLAND.

The original inhabitants of this country were the Celtes, who probably migrated from Gaul. It was but little known to the Romans till the time of Julius Cæsar, who meditated the conquest of the whole island. He accordingly embarked from France, and having reached the opposite shore near Dover (Aug. 26, B.C. 55), defeated the Britons who opposed him. The conquests of Cæsar however were transient, and after his final departure the Britons were not visited again by the Romans till the reign of Claudius; who resolved on the invasion of this country (A. D. 43). His arms were every where crowned with success, though he met with much opposition on the part of the natives: for, it was not till the year

79, that the whole of England was reduced to the form of a Roman province.

We know but little of the history of this country during the time that it was under the Romans, except a few attempts at various times to shake off the yoke; which always proved abortive. In 410, when the Romans found themselves obliged to withdraw their forces from the distant provinces in order to defend themselves at home, they relinquished this island to its inhabitants. The subsequent encroachments of the Picts and Scots induced the Britons to call in the Saxons to their assistance. Hengist came over with the first party as friends; but soon after his arrival he threw off the mask, boldly attacked the Britons themselves, and finally succeeded in establishing the kingdom of *Kent* (455). The success of Hengist and his followers induced other Saxon chiefs to try their fortunes, and attempt settlements in the island. One of these, named Ælla, arrived in 477; and, after carrying on war for thirteen years, succeeded in founding the kingdom of *Sussex* (490). Cerdic, another Saxon chieftain, arrived in Britain about 495, and after a war of twenty-four years he erected the kingdom of the West Saxons or *Wessex* (519). Other bands of adventurers landed at different times, and under different leaders, on the eastern coasts of the country, and established other kingdoms. Erkenwin founded the kingdom of the East Saxons, or *Essex* (527); which was chiefly dismembered from Kent. The kingdom of *East Anglia* was erected by Uffa (575); and that of *Mercia* by Creda (585). The kingdom of *Bernicia* may be said to begin with Ida (547); and the kingdom of *Deira*, with Ælla (562): these two last states were soon after united (590), and formed the powerful kingdom of *Northumberland*. In consequence of these encroachments the ancient Britons were confined to the principality of Wales. These seven kingdoms formed what is called the *Saxon Heptarchy;* a term, however, which may possibly impress us with false ideas on this subject. For the four small kingdoms of East Anglia, Essex, Kent, and Sussex soon

fell into a state of imbecility and subjection to their more powerful neighbours; and the dominion of the country appears to have been divided between the three flourishing kingdoms of Northumberland, Mercia, and Wessex. In 686, Ceodwalla king of Wessex subdued the kingdom of Sussex: and in 792, Offa king of Mercia put an end to the kingdom of East Anglia. In 823, Egbert king of Wessex subdued the whole kingdom of Mercia: in consequence of which the two tributary states of Kent and Essex also submitted. Egbert carried his arms into Northumberland, and added this kingdom to his other conquests: and thus became the first monarch of all England (827). But though Egbert thus conquered the whole heptarchy, yet he retained possession of Wessex, Sussex, Kent, and Essex only; permitting the other three kingdoms to be governed by tributary kings: in which state they continued till the invasion of the country by the Danes. When Ethelwolf came to the throne (836) he gave the government of Kent, Sussex, and Essex, to his eldest son Athelstan, with the title of king; and this division continued till the death of Ethelbald (860), when Ethelbert succeeded to his dominions, and thereby became sovereign of all England.

About 866, the *Danes*, under their king Ivar, landed in East Anglia; and by the year 874 had made themselves masters not only of that state, but also of Mercia and Northumberland. In 878 they were in possession of the whole kingdom. King Alfred, however, soon after recovered his crown and obliged them either to submit or to leave the country. Those who chose the former were allowed to settle in East Anglia and Northumberland (880); where they lived in a state of subjection to the English kings. But they were finally reduced by Edred (952). About the latter end of the tenth century, the Danes again invaded England with a considerable force, and finally succeeded in conquering the whole kingdom (1013). The last of the Danish kings was Hardicanute, who finished a short and inglorious reign in 1041. Edward the Confessor, a prince of the Saxon line, was then raised to the throne.

Edward, by his will, declared his cousin, *William Duke of Normandy*, to be his successor. Edgar Atheling was the undoubted heir to the crown: but Harold, the son of Godwin, stepped into the vacant throne; and he was worthy the dignity to which he aspired. William, however, to assert his title, invaded England; defeated Harold at the battle of Hastings; and was afterwards crowned king of England at Westminster (1066). From this monarch all the subsequent kings of England are descended.

William died in 1087, and left the kingdom of England to his second surviving son William II; whilst Robert, his elder son, succeeded him in Normandy. Henry II, the head of the house of Plantagenet, ascended the throne in right of his mother Matilda (1154); and was the greatest prince of his time. He was duke of Normandy, and count of Anjou and Maine, in right of his deceased father Geoffrey Plantagenet (1151); and by his marriage (1252) with Eleonora, the duchess of Aquitain, united in his own person a considerable portion of the territories of France. He afterwards undertook the conquest of Ireland, which soon submitted to his dominion (1172). But the greater part of his possessions in France were lost through the weakness of John (1204): as will be more particularly related in the history of France. Edward I annexed the principality of Wales to his dominions (1283); and taking advantage of the disputes between Bruce and Baliol in Scotland, made a temporary conquest of that kingdom (1296). The victorious career of Edward III, in France, shines conspicuous in the page of history: although the conquests which he there made (1360) were eventually lost (1377) before his death. Henry V revived the English claim to the throne of that country. The *battle of Agincourt* (1415) was the prelude to future victories: and at Troyes he concluded the famous treaty (1420), by which he was appointed regent of the kingdom, and was likewise acknowledged heir to the crown. The affairs of the English were ruined on the continent by the patriotic exertions of the Maid of Orleans, who compelled them

to raise the siege of that city (1429); and established Charles VII on the throne. James, king of Scotland, succeeded to the throne of England, in right of his mother the unfortunate Mary (1603). Charles I, his son and successor (1625), had married a catholic princess; which prejudiced the nation against him. He conducted himself in a very arbitrary manner; and, not finding the parliament sufficiently obsequious, he dissolved it, and attempted to rule without their interposition. The king's necessities, however, obliged him to reassemble the parliament after an intermission of eleven years. But instead of assisting him, they opposed all his measures. The breach was irreparable; and hostilities soon commenced. The unfortunate monarch fled into Scotland; but, being surrendered by that nation, he was afterwards tried and executed (1649).

A republican form of government was attempted to be established on the ruins of the monarchy: and *Oliver Cromwell* was placed at the head of public affairs. He refused the title of king, and contented himself with that of protector. On his death Charles II was recalled from exile, and by the policy and address of general Monk was restored to the throne (1660). The obnoxious measures of his successor James II, and his daring encroachments upon the civil and religious liberties of his subjects, excited general discontent and hatred. In this extremity, the aid of William prince of Orange (nephew and son-in-law to James) was solicited by the nobility. He arrived in England with a numerous army (Nov. 5, 1688): and James, abandoned by every one, abdicated the throne and retired to France.

The subsequent conquests of the English in the East Indies and in America, will be related in the history of those countries.

SLESWICK.

This duchy was formerly (as at present) united to Denmark; but it appears to have been erected into a sovereign state by Valdemar II, about the year 1231, in favour of his son Abel. His descendants possessed it till the death of Henry, the last duke of this race, when it reverted to the crown (1385). Olaus, however, soon after, bestowed it on Gerhard duke of Holstein; but on the death of his son Adolphus without issue (1459) it was again united to the kingdom of Denmark. On the accession of John to the throne (1481), he was compelled to cede Sleswick and Holstein to his brother Frederic, who afterwards, on the abdication of Christian II, was proclaimed king of Denmark and Norway (1523); and this duchy has ever since been annexed to the crown.

DENMARK.

The ancient inhabitants of this country were the Cimbri and the Teutones: the former occupied Jutland, and the latter the Isles. They were a race of bold adventurers, and, as far back as the fifth century, insulted all the sea coasts of Europe. They commenced their predatory excursions in England soon after the Romans left it: but they did not make any permanent settlement there till towards the end of the ninth century.

Harold, surnamed *blue-tooth*, is reckoned as the first Christian king: he began to reign in A. D. 935, and was baptized in the year 965. But excepting those events which immediately relate to our own country, the history of Denmark affords little that is interesting till the accession of Valdemar I, who was one of the greatest of the Danish monarchs. He reduced the neighbouring kingdom of Norway (1163); and left his dominions in a very flourishing state. Valdemar III

seized on the government in 1340, and left it to his grandson Olaus (1375), then a minor, and afterwards king of Norway (1380). Olaus died at the age of seventeen, and was succeeded by his mother Margaret (1387).

Margaret raised the kingdom to its highest pitch of glory: and having succeeded afterwards to Sweden (1388), she formed the *Union of Calmar* (1397); by which it was proposed that these three kingdoms should in future be under one sovereign, elected by each kingdom in its turn. Her successor being destitute of her great abilities, the Union of Calmar fell to nothing: but Norway continued annexed to Denmark. In 1448 the crown fell to Christian I, from whom the present royal family of Denmark is descended: and in 1525 the protestant religion was introduced there, by his son Frederic duke of Sleswick, who had succeeded to the throne about two years before. In the war with Sweden, his son Frederic III was obliged to cede Schonen, the island of Rugen, Halland, and Bleking (1660). And in 1814 the Danes were compelled by the allied powers to cede Norway to the Swedes.

NORWAY.

This country forms part of the Scandinavia of the ancients; and its early history is involved in impenetrable obscurity. It was formerly, as at present, united to the crown of Denmark: but Harold, surnamed *yellow-hair*, shook off the Danish yoke (A.D. 868) *. Sweyn I, king of Denmark, reduced Norway in the year 1000, and governed it by counts; but it was rendered independent again by Olaus II (1015). It was soon afterwards reduced by Canute II (1030); who on his death (1036) left it to his son Sweyn. On the death of

* During his reign, a party of adventurers from this country insulted for a long time the coasts of France; and eventually succeeded in conquering the province of Normandy (912).

Canute III king of Denmark, Magnus I king of Norway and the son of Olaus was elected to fill the throne of that kingdom (1042): but on his decease (1048) the two crowns were again separated. About the year 1163 it appears that this country was reduced by Valdemar I king of Denmark; though it probably recovered its independence on his death (1182). In 1319 Magnus VII was chosen king of Sweden; but was eventually expelled on account of his obnoxious measures (1365).

On the death of Haquin VI (1380), his son Olaus, who was king of Denmark, succeeded to the throne: who dying without issue (1387), was succeeded by his mother Margaret daughter of the late Valdemar III king of Denmark. This princess also succeeded in the following year to the throne of Sweden (1388); and being thus in possession of the three crowns, projected the celebrated *Union of Calmar*. On her death however (1412), great dissentions arose in the state; and after various revolutions, Norway remained united to the present house of Oldenburgh. Its subsequent history, therefore, is involved in that of Denmark, till the year 1814, when the Danes were compelled to cede it to the Swedes.

SWEDEN.

This country, together with Norway, formed the Scandinavia of the ancients, the original seat of the Goths and Vandals. The history of it, as indeed of all the northern nations, is confused and uninteresting; the introduction of Christianity by Anscharius (A.D. 830) seems to present the first authentic records. From this period we meet with nothing but murders, massacres, and ravages, till the reign of Berger II, who was expelled on account of his barbarity (1319). Magnus VII king of Norway was elected to fill the vacant throne, and reigned over both countries forty-five years: till at last, attempting to make himself absolute, he was expelled; and his nephew

Albert, duke of Mecklenburg, advanced to the throne (1365). This imprudent prince, detested by all ranks, was likewise deprived of his crown: and Margaret of Denmark and Norway was elected queen of Sweden (1388). The form of government being nearly the same in the three kingdoms, she projected the famous Union, already alluded to, whereby they were, for the future, to be under one sovereign elected by each kingdom in its turn.

This union proved the source of those wars which raged in Denmark and Sweden upwards of a century; and which terminated at length in the separation of these countries. For, on the death of Christopher III (1448), the Swedes assumed independence and chose Charles VIII for their sovereign: but he was obliged to submit to Christian I of Denmark (1457). This latter monarch being afterwards deposed by his subjects (1464), Charles was restored. The internal disputes of this country rendered it an easy prey to John king of Denmark and Norway (1497): but he was soon after expelled (1502). The Swedish affairs continued to be involved in this dreadful confusion till the great *Revolution*, which restored the kingdom to its liberty; and laid the foundation of its future grandeur: the occasion of it was as follows.

In 1518, Christian II king of Denmark and Norway invaded Sweden, and eventually subdued the whole country (1520). To secure himself on the throne, and to punish his enemies, he formed the diabolical design of massacring all the nobility, and he proved to be one of the most bloody tyrants that ever wore a crown. The Swedes, however, were delivered from his cruelty and oppression by the fortitude, zeal, and perseverance of *Gustavus Vasa*, a descendant of the ancient kings, and the regal dignity was conferred on him as a reward for his merit (1523). To this prince the Swedes are indebted for the establishment of the Protestant religion (1529).

Charles X, by the treaty of Oliva (1660), compelled the Poles to give up a part of Livonia; and also obliged the Danes by the treaty of Copenhagen, in the same year, to

yield Schonen, Halland, Bleking, and the island of Rugen. The history of Charles XII is well known. Bold, enterprising, and brave, he opposed with a becoming spirit the powerful combination that was formed against him, on his accession to the throne (1697). The Russians however invaded the country (1702), and in the course of a few years reduced a great part of the Swedish possessions (1710): which, together with some other territories, were ceded to them by the peace of Nystadt (1721). In the following reign the Russians made further encroachments on this country (1743). In 1808 the emperor Alexander reduced the whole of Finland: but the Swedes were afterwards rewarded, for the share which they took in their alliance against Bonaparte, by the cession of Norway (1814).

FINLAND.

Great part of this country had been conquered by the Swedes about the year A.D.1157; and the remaining part about the middle of the thirteenth century by Birger, who *forced* the inhabitants to embrace Christianity. In the year 1721 Carelia was ceded to the Russians: and in 1743 the provinces to the west of the Kymene were also ceded to that power. In 1808 the emperor Alexander again conquered the whole of this country: which was formally ceded to him by the treaty of Fredericsham in the following year.

LIVONIA.

The history of this country, previously to the twelfth century of the Christian æra, is but little known: but it was probably inhabited by a race of men similar to the surrounding nations, and who were long immersed in ignorance, barbarism,

and paganism. Canute VI, king of Denmark, made an expedition into Esthonia (A. D. 1196); and, having conquered that province, introduced Christianity therein. In 1201 bishop Albert instituted the order of the *knights of Christ:* whose object was to reduce Livonia and to compel the inhabitants to embrace Christianity. This order, being too weak of itself, was soon after incorporated with the Teutonic knights (1231); who eventually reduced the country and governed their new states by *preceptors*. In 1347 these knights purchased Esthonia from Waldemar III king of Denmark; and in 1521 the grand master of the Teutonic order in Prussia sold the sovereignty of Livonia to Walter Plettenberg, the general of the knights of the Cross: who, together with the states of Livonia, were discharged from their allegiance to the grand master of the Teutonic order.

The independence of the *knights of Livonia* (as they were now called) was however but of short duration: Gothard Ketlern, the last grand master, embraced Lutheranism; and surrendered his dominions to the king of Poland (1561). A dreadful war immediately broke out between Russia, Sweden, and Poland, which laid waste this country for a whole century! till by the treaty of Oliva (1660) it was given up by Poland to Sweden. It was again miserably ravaged in the great northern war which broke out in the beginning of the last century, when the Russians conquered it (1710): and it was afterwards ceded to them in full sovereignty.

SIBERIA.

This immense country, which comprehends the whole northern part of Asia, was formerly the abode of those Huns who ravaged the western world, and sacked even Rome itself under their commander Attila (A. D. 453). The Moguls eventually succeeded the Huns; and, towards the end of the sixteenth century, the Russians, equally unprincipled and un-

civilized, invaded this country (1581); and by degrees reduced it to their dominion. The mind turns with disgust from such uninteresting and unprofitable warfare.

KIPJAK.

The first authentic and distinct account that we have of this country is the invasion of it by the troops of the celebrated Zinghis Khân (A.D. 1223), who afterwards greatly extended his dominions there by reducing the Russians, Bulgarians, and other barbarous nations (1237). His successors upheld the sovereignty of the Kipjâk or Mogul empire above two centuries and a half. Soon after the death of the celebrated Timûr (1405), who interfered with the concerns of this empire, it fell to pieces; and from the ruins of it arose the three rival Tatar states of Astracân, Casân, and the Crimea: during these intestine commotions, the Russians were gradually gaining strength and independence. At length John Basilowitz, the tributary king of Russia, not only threw off the disgraceful yoke (1477), but made the Tatars themselves dependent on his power. His grandson John IV reduced Casân (1552), and in a year or two afterwards conquered the kingdom of Astracân (1554), together with the rest of the country possessed by the Kipjâks (1557), except the Crimea: and it has ever since formed part of the Russian empire.

RUSSIA.

Russia, or Moscovy, was anciently inhabited by many independent tribes, viz. Huns, Scythians, Sarmatians, Sclavi, &c. all of whom were called Russians, i. e. a divided or dispersed people. The history of these tribes abounds in conjecture and

fable : and the origin of the Russians themselves (as a nation), though not prior to the ninth century, is involved in impenetrable obscurity. Invited by the contending states from one of the neighbouring nations, Ruric and his two brothers united several provinces of the empire (which was at this time probably bounded by the Nieper and the Volga), and thus became the first duke of Russia (A.D. 862). His great-grandson Wolodomir I, together with great part of the nation, embraced Christianity (988) on account of his marriage with Anne, the sister of Constantine VIII, emperor of Constantinople, whereby the rites of the Greek church came to be established in Russia. The country afterwards continued a long time in a deplorable condition, disaffected and disunited; which rendered it an easy prey (1237) to the Moguls who had recently established themselves in Kipjâk*: and under whose dominion, though governed by their own tributary kings, they remained above two centuries and a half.

At length *John Basilowitz*, taking advantage of the weak state of the Kipjâk or Mogul empire, boldly opposed the dominion of those Tatars and eventually freed his country from their yoke (1477). He re-united the several provinces, and was the first who assumed the title of *Czar*. His grandson John IV totally reduced the Kipjâk or Mogul country, and annexed it to the empire (1557) : so that that tribe was now confined solely to the Crimea. During the reign of *Peter the Great*, which commenced in 1689, this country was raised to its highest pitch of strength and glory. In 1700 he joined in a league with Poland and Denmark to divide the dominions of Charles XII, king of Sweden : the issue of which has been already related. During this contest he invaded Livonia, Ingria, and Carelia (1702)† which he eventually conquered

* At this time the two principal states in Russia were the duchies of Kiow and Wladimir.

† In the course of the second campaign he made himself master of the fort of Nyenschantz, which he razed to the ground : and in this desert and marshy spot he laid the foundation of the city of *Petersburgh* (May

(1710), and then turned his arms against Finland, part of which was ceded to him by the treaty of Nystadt (1721). Henceforth Peter took the title of *Emperor of all the Russias*, which was soon acknowledged by all the European powers.

During the contest of Great Britain with her American colonies, the empress Catherine II, jealous of the maritime superiority of the English, attempted to form an *Armed Neutrality* (1780). The subsequent invasion and conquest of the Crimea (1784) added indeed to the extent, but not to the honour, of the Russian empire. By a second division of the unhappy kingdom of Poland (1793) the empress added considerably to her territories: but death soon after put a stop to her ambitious career (1796). By the treaty of Tilsit (1807) the present emperor Alexander gained a small addition to his territories on the side of Prussia. A rupture with Sweden in the following year (1808) enabled him also to extend his frontiers by the conquest of Finland. The recent invasion of Russia by Bonaparte, and the important events to which it has given rise, are well known to every reader.

CRIM-TATARY.

This country was the ancient Bosporus, and was governed by kings of its own from the earliest times: the peninsula, which forms a principal part of it, was called Chersonesus Taurica, now the Crimea. In course of time the Scythians began to oppress this country; for we find that Parisades III, not being able to pay one of their princes the unreasonable tribute he demanded, voluntarily resigned the kingdom to Mithridates the Great, king of Pontus (B. C. 90). His descendants possessed it after the loss of their paternal dominions;

27, 1703), which has since become the capital of the Russian empire, and which may now vie with the most splendid and populous cities in Europe.

subject probably in some measure to the will of Rome: although the country never formed part of the Roman empire.

We know but little more of this country till it was reduced by the Moguls (A.D. 1237); at which time it was probably under the dominion of some of the dukes of Russia. The Genoese took the city of Caffa (1266); and probably soon after reduced some part of the peninsula. They held this city and its dependencies till they were driven out by Mohammed II, the Ottoman emperor (1476), who ceded it to one of the Tatar princes dependent on the Porte. The empress Catherine II, however, invaded and reduced the whole country (1784): and it now belongs to Russia.

UKRAINE.

This country, together with Podolia, forms the territory lying between the Nieper and the Niester rivers. Its early history is but little known; though it probably submitted alternately to the Russians and Poles. The Moguls took it in A.D. 1242; though it probably recovered its independence soon after: but it was seized by the Poles in 1340. In latter times it was inhabited by the Zaporog Cossacs, who were under the command of a chief (called *Hetman*), and who defended the Polish frontiers against the Turks and Tatars: and the country was formally ceded to them in the year 1562. They were afterwards conquered by the Russians (1676), in which state they remained till they put themselves under the protection of the Crim-Tatars (1709). Dissatisfied, however, with their treatment, they returned again to the dominion of the Russians (1733). The empress Catherine II, irritated with their restless disposition and frequent revolts, sent a numerous army into their country, destroyed their principal city, and dispersed the inhabitants over her immense empire (1775). The Cossacs were a powerful aid to the allied armies in their late invasions of the French territories.

LITHUANIA.

The Russian annals do not speak of this country before the twelfth century; although it had probably been long governed by its own dukes till the time of Jajello, who, by marrying Hedwiga queen of Poland, became king of that country under the name of Uladislaus V (1386). It was on this occasion that he renounced paganism, and established the Christian religion. The duchy was afterwards bestowed on another branch of the family, they doing homage for the same: till, by a formal instrument, it was irrevocably united to the crown of Poland. On the dismemberment of that country it was, together with other provinces, seized by the Russians.

POLAND.

Poland was anciently called Sarmatia: and under its more modern name was a nation of considerable extent and importance, though *now* blotted out from the list of kingdoms. One Lechus is said to have migrated from the Cimmerian Bosporus, and to have subdued it about the year A.D. 550. His descendants kept possession of it during the space of three centuries: but their history is fabulous. Anarchy and confusion succeeded to that dynasty, till the citizens raised Piastus to the ducal dignity (842). His descendant Boleslaus I was invested with the title of *king* by Otho III emperor of Germany (1000). In 1230 a portion of this country was seized by the Teutonic knights. Jajello duke of Lithuania, by his marriage with Hedwiga queen of Poland (1386), united the two countries: and in 1466 Casimir IV obliged the Teutonic knights to cede Royal Prussia, and to hold Ducal Prussia as a fief of the crown. His son Sigismund I raised the kingdom of Poland to its highest pitch of splendour and power: he broke the dominion of the Teutonic knights; and granted to Albert,

their former grand master, that part of Prussia which was then in their possession (1525).

The last king of Poland was Stanislaus Augustus, who was elected in 1764, through the influence and intimidation of the empress of Russia. Soon after his accession Russia, Prussia, and Austria, entered into an alliance to dismember and divide this country (1772) : and a formal instrument was drawn up, whereby these royal plunderers guarantied to each other their respective portions of the spoil. Russia had about a third part of Lithuania, together with part of Polish Livonia; Prussia seized on Royal or Polish Prussia (with the exception of Dantzic and Thorn), together with some districts bordering on Brandenburgh ; and Austria claimed Red Russia, together with part of the bordering provinces of Podolia and Little Poland. This dismemberment was afterwards sanctioned by the Polish senate. These three partitioning powers also effected a great change in the constitution of the country, which greatly abridged its power as a nation : but in 1791 the king and the nobles, almost unanimously and without any foreign interference, established another form of government, in which the rights and privileges of all orders were equitably consulted. The empress of Russia interposed; and, under pretence of guarantying the constitution of 1772, sent a large army into Poland. But the real object of her solicitude was a second partition of this unhappy country, in conjunction with Prussia (1793) : and (notwithstanding the patriotic exertions of the brave Kosciusko) Stanislaus Augustus was soon after obliged to surrender his crown into the hands of the empress of Russia. Austria, who had joined in this last attack, was rewarded with a share of the spoils : and hence arose the third and last partition of this unfortunate country. And in this manner ended the ancient and once powerful kingdom of Poland!

The hatred of the Poles to the Prussian government manifested itself, after the battle of Jena (Oct. 14, 1806), by a general insurrection of the southern provinces of Prussia : and by the peace of Tilsit (1807) Prussia was compelled to cede

nearly all the territories which she had so unjustly dismembered from Poland: and which were immediately erected by Bonaparte into a sovereign state under the title of the *Duchy of Warsaw*, and given to Frederic Augustus the new king of Saxony. But on the deposition of Bonaparte, these provinces were, by the congress at Vienna (1815), restored to the Prussians.

PRUSSIA.

The ancient history of this nation, like that of most other countries, is lost in clouds of fiction and romance. They were probably dependent on the Poles about the time that their history becomes interesting. On the expulsion of the Christians from the Holy Land, the *knights of the Teutonic Order* returned to Europe. Encouraged by the emperor and the Poles (A. D. 1226), they endeavoured to propagate their faith by the sword; a practice which had been too frequent in this part of the world. Prussia (then inhabited by pagans) first felt the terror of their arms (1230); and before the middle of the thirteenth century they might claim the double merit of having extirpated independence and infidelity from the country. In 1311 they took Pomerelia, and thus extended their conquests; but the Lithuanians, Poles, &c. greatly abridged their power and dominion (1422): and at length, after a bloody war of twelve years duration, Casimir IV king of Poland compelled them to submission on the most ignominious terms: he divided Prussia into two parts; the western part of which he annexed to Poland; and the eastern part was suffered to remain in the hands of the knights, dependent on his will (1466).

Albert, margrave of Brandenburg, was elected grand master of the Teutonic order in 1511. Refusing to pay homage to the king of Poland (1519), yet unable to resist his superior power, he laid aside the habit of his order, became a convert

to the faith of Luther, and received the investiture of the province in quality of a secular *duke* (1525). The emperor Leopold conferred the title of *king* on Frederic I (1701), which was afterwards acknowledged by all the powers in Europe; and which has ever since been retained by his descendants. His grandson, Frederic II, was an ambitious, enterprising and enlightened monarch: and greatly celebrated in the annals of literature. The part which this country took in the first coalition against France (1792) did not add to the glory of their arms: for, by the peace of Basle (1795), Frederic William II ceded to the republic all his territories to the left of the Rhine. His son Frederic William III, the present king, afterwards lost all his territories to the left of the Elbe; and was forced to give up most of the provinces that his predecessors had dismembered from Poland, and which were erected into a new sovereignty under the title of the *Duchy of Warsaw* (1807). But, by the congress at Vienna (1815), these territories have been recently restored to him.

BOHEMIA.

The original inhabitants of this country were the Boii, a people of ancient Gaul, who settled here about the year B.C. 590. This tribe was expelled by the Marcomanni, who were afterwards reduced by the Slavi, &c. These were in their turn subdued by Attila, the celebrated chief of the Huns, in the fifth century of the Christian æra: but on his death (A.D. 453) they shook off the yoke. Charlemagne rendered the Bohemians tributary; but their dependence was of short duration. The first Christian duke of this country was Borzivojus, about the end of the ninth century. The title of *king* was bestowed on Ladislaus duke of Bohemia by the emperor Henry IV (1086). Since that period, these monarchs have been electors and chief cupbearers of the German empire; and the crown has been elective.

After the death of Winceslaus V, the last native king, without issue (1306), Rodolph of Austria was elected to the vacant throne; since which time the sovereigns of this country have been chosen from various countries: and as the crowns of Hungary and the empire were also elective, it frequently happened that the same person was selected to govern the three nations. Ferdinand, the brother of the emperor Charles V, (having married Anne, sister of Lewis, the last king of Bohemia and Hungary, who died without issue,) was elected to the throne (1526): and this country has remained ever since in the possession of the house of Austria.

HUNGARY.

That part of the kingdom of Hungary which lies to the west of the Danube was anciently called Pannonia; and that division of the country lying to the east of the Teisse was part of Dacia: the territory lying between these two rivers was inhabited by the Jazyges. Pannonia was conquered by the Romans (B.C. 35): and Dacia was reduced by Trajan (A.D. 106). The latter was prudently abandoned by Aurelian (274), who made the Danube the boundary of his empire. The whole of this country was afterwards possessed by the Huns under the celebrated Attila. On the death of this renowned warrior (453) his immense kingdom became a prey to foreign invaders. The Ostrogoths seized upon Pannonia; whilst the Gepidæ made themselves masters of Dacia. The Ostrogoths having left Pannonia to invade Italy (488), this part of their dominions was possessed by the Gepidæ: but the Avars eventually drove out the Gepidæ from the whole country (566); and held it to the end of the eighth century.

Charlemagne, after a cruel war of eight years duration, either conquered this country (799); or so reduced it, that it did not again make any conspicuous figure in history. It re-

mained in possession of his family till the reign of Charles the Fat, when the Onigars, Croati, Sclavi, &c. (various tribes from Scythia) invaded it (886); and gave names to the territories they possessed. By degrees these states became united, and chose Toxus, one of the old royal race of Attila, to be their king (900), whose son, Geysa, was persuaded to embrace Christianity (989). During the reign of his successors, the country was frequently harassed with civil commotions by the rival competitors for the throne. The Turks, under Soliman II, entered and reduced the greatest part of the country in 1541: and though the Hungarians, by the assistance of Ferdinand of Austria, recovered a considerable portion of it (1551), yet it was a constant source of dispute till the year 1615; when the sultan Achmet restored all the conquests made by his predecessors.

The crown of Hungary was declared to be hereditary in the house of Austria, by the diet of Presburg in 1687; and it has remained with that family ever since.

GERMANY.

The ancient history of the Germans is altogether enveloped in obscurity: nor do we for many ages know any thing more of them than may be learned from the account of their wars with the Romans. It is very difficult to fix the limits of the country called Germany by the ancient writers: the southern Germans were intermixed with the Gauls, and the northern ones with the Scythians; and thus their history becomes confused. About the year B.C. 14, Drusus and Tiberius reduced all that part of Germany to the south of the Danube: and about five years afterwards Drusus brought into subjection all the nations from the Rhine to the Elbe. The Germans however, soon after, recovered the latter conquests; and the Romans were obliged to make the Rhine and the Danube

the boundaries of their empire in this quarter. The other parts of Germany, to the north of the Danube, were in early times inhabited by rude and barbarous tribes, of whose history we have no records. It appears, however, that they were all reduced to subjection by the celebrated Attila, king of the Huns, about the middle of the fifth century: who extended his empire to the Alps. But on his death (A.D. 453) it is probable that many of those nations shook off the yoke: hence a number of independent states sprang up, of whose history we know but little till the time of Charlemagne. The principal of these were the *Ostrogoths*, the *Alemanni*, the *Saxons*, and the *Thuringians*. Previous to this period the *Franks*, who were originally a German nation, but who were now settled in Gaul, had considerably extended their dominions in this country, and rendered most of the bordering nations dependent on their power. They reduced the Alemanni in 496; the Thuringians in 531: and the possessions of the Ostrogoths about the middle of the same century. Towards the middle of the eighth century, Pepin subdued the dukes of Suabia (749) who had assumed independence ever since the middle of the seventh century: and Charlemagne not only reduced Bavaria (788), but, after a most cruel and destructive war of thirty years duration, completed the conquest of the country by the final reduction of the Saxons (803). His successor Louis, surnamed *the pious*, created his own son Louis king of Bavaria: who, by a subsequent partition of the imperial dominions between his brothers and himself, settled by the treaty of Verdun (843), succeeded to all the territories on the right of the Rhine. From this epoch we ought to consider Germany as separated from the empire of France, and as having its own particular kings and emperors. Louis IV died in 912: and in him failed the male issue of Charlemagne in this country.

But although Germany had been erected into an independent kingdom, it had hitherto been governed by princes of the race of Charlemagne; whose interests were sometimes

blended, and at other times at variance, with each other. About this period, however, the German nobles (who had long been aiming at independence) asserted their natural rights; and in a general diet elected Conrad count of Franconia to be *king* of Germany (912): an event which was the cause of many rebellions, excited by envy and prejudice. Henry I enlarged the boundaries of the empire, by the acquisition of Lorraine (921): and his son Otho I, surnamed *the Great*, united the kingdom of Italy to his crown (952). On a second expedition to that country he proceeded to Rome, where he received the *imperial* title from pope John XII (962), and which has ever since been retained by his successors *. The dukes, counts, and margraves, (that is to say, the governors of the provinces and the commanders on the frontiers), continued for a long time to be considered as imperial officers, without pretending to any hereditary or sovereign rights. But during the internal troubles of the empire, and the quarrels with the popes †, they gradually assumed a power of transmitting their influence and authority to their children; and at length usurped all the rights of sovereignty. Hence the rise of so many independent petty states in Germany; and which renders it so difficult to insert them on the chart. In 1440 Frederic IV was elected to the imperial throne: whose family possessed it till the title was renounced by the present emperor of Austria. Maximilian, the son of Frederic, by his marriage with Mary, duchess of Burgundy (1477), annexed the Netherlands to the house of Austria. He was elected emperor in 1493; and, by establishing a perpetual

* The custom of the triple coronation (for Germany, Italy, and Rome) subsisted many centuries: and from the time of Otho the Great to Maximilian I (1508) no *king* of Germany took the title of *emperor* till after he had been formally crowned by the pope.

† This contest between the German emperors and the popes is extremely curious and interesting: and more particularly as the conquest gained by the latter was the origin of the vast power afterwards assumed by succeeding pontiffs over the other princes of Christendom.

peace between the separate Germanic states, laid the foundation of the subsequent grandeur of the empire. His son Philip, archduke of Austria, espoused Jane the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain (1496); and, by this connection, brought the crown of Spain into his family. The issue of that marriage was Charles V, who succeeded his maternal grandfather on the throne of Spain (1516); and, on the death of Maximilian (1519), not only succeeded to the Netherlands, but laid claim also to the imperial crown. He had for his competitor Francis I, king of France: and the mutual claims of these two hostile monarchs on each other's dominions were the subject of perpetual warfare. Francis II, the last of the German emperors, was a principal agent in the first coalition against France. The events of this war will be related under the history of that country. It was terminated by the treaty of Campo Formio (1797): whereby the house of Austria ceded the Belgic provinces and Lombardy; and obtained the Venetian territories as an indemnity. In the second coalition the emperor was again unfortunate, and was obliged to cede in full sovereignty the left side of the Rhine to the French republic; and Tuscany to the duke of Parma. The third coalition was more unfortunate than either of the preceding: the war commenced on the 8th of September 1806, and on the 26th of December in the same year the emperor was compelled to sign the treaty of Presburg: whereby he lost all his possessions in Suabia, together with the Tyrol and the Venetian territories.

The dissolution of the German empire was a necessary consequence of the peace of Presburg. By one of the articles of this treaty the emperor had acknowledged the independent sovereignty of Bavaria, of Wirtemberg, and of the elector of Baden. On the 12th of July in the same year France had concluded, with many members of the Germanic body, a treaty of alliance, under the name of the *Confederation of the Rhine*. On the 1st of August, these states notified to the diet at Ratisbon, their separation from the Germanic body: and on

the 6th of the same month the emperor Francis II abdicated the imperial throne. Thus *ended* the German *empire*, after having existed as an independent state for nine hundred and sixty-three years, from the treaty of Verdun in 843; and as an empire eight hundred and forty-four years, from the coronation of Otho I in 962. As early as the year 1804 the archduke of *Austria* had assumed the title of *emperor*. Independent of his German dominions he possesses the kingdoms of Hungary and Bohemia, together with most of the provinces which he so unjustly seized in the several disgraceful partitions of Poland. The electors of *Bavaria* and *Wirtemberg*, who had enriched themselves with part of the Austrian possessions, took the title of *kings* on the 1st of January 1806. The elector of *Saxony* also, having obtained from Bonaparte the new duchy of Warsaw, joined the Confederation of the Rhine, under the title of *king* (December 11, 1806). Various other changes of title and territory have taken place: but a detail of the whole of them would far exceed the limits assigned to the present work. The late successes of the allies have destroyed the Confederation of the Rhine, and restored many of the usurped provinces to their original owners. Nevertheless the new regal titles still remain. The affairs of Germany are, by the congress of Vienna (1815), intrusted to a federative diet, of which Austria is declared to be the president.

NETHERLANDS.

This country was part of the territories of the ancient Belgæ who were conquered by Julius Cæsar (B. C. 56), as will be related in the history of France: and it continued in possession of the Romans till the decline of their empire. After this, the Franks became masters of it. Under the first race of the French monarchs, it formed part of the kingdom of Soissons and of Austrasia or Metz: and on the division of the French empire (A. D. 843), it formed the kingdom of

Lorrain. It consists of seventeen provinces: ten of which were formerly known by the name of the Spanish provinces, now Flanders; and the remaining seven afterwards assumed the appellation of the United Provinces, or Holland. We know the early history of but few of these provinces. They were formerly under the government of counts or earls, who were appointed by the family of Charlemagne: but, on the extinction of that race and the subsequent contentions between the neighbouring powers, they gradually usurped the sovereignty, and thus obtained a rank amongst the independent states.

We read of the bishops of *Utrecht* as far back as the year 723: it is probable that they were then dependent on the Franks, and that they did not assume the character of sovereign princes till long after the extinction of the family of Charlemagne. In 1528 this bishopric, together with the states of Overyssel, &c. was conquered by Charles V, emperor of Germany.

Little is known of the provinces of *Zutphen* and *Guelders*, till the emperor Henry IV erected them into an earldom in favour of Otho (1079), whose father had been earl of Zutphen. The emperor Lewis V bestowed the title of duke of Guelders on Rainald II (1339); which was ever after retained by his successors. Arnold, duke of Guelders, sold the reversion of his duchy to Charles, surnamed *the bold*, duke of Burgundy; to be possessed by him after his death, which happened in 1473. These provinces however rebelled under Charles, the grandson of Arnold (1492); but were finally reduced by the emperor Charles V (1543).

The sovereignty of the earls of *Frieseland* may be dated from the year 985, when the emperor Otho III bestowed on Thierri II all the territories which his predecessors had held of the empire, and which he himself had conquered from the Frieselanders. About the end of the twelfth century, his successors appear to have assumed the title of earls of *Holland*. In 1299 John II, earl of Hainault, succeeded to these provinces in right of his mother Adelaide: the last earl of Holland having died without issue.

The first earl of *Hainault* was Regnier, about the year 875. By the marriage of Richildis with Baldwin de Mons this province became afterwards united to Flanders (1067): but on his death it was again separated (1070). It was once more united by the marriage of Baldwin of Hainault with Margaret countess of Flanders, who afterwards succeeded her brother in Flanders (1191). On the decease of Margaret II (1280) she was succeeded in Hainault by her grandson John II; who soon after came into possession of Holland, Friesland, &c. (1299). The last sovereign of these states was Jaqueline, who finding herself unable to maintain them, surrendered them to her cousin Philip, surnamed *the good*, duke of Burgundy (1433).

Baldwin, who married the daughter of Charles the Bald, king of France, was created the first earl of *Flanders* and Artois (862). On the death of Philip (1191), Baldwin earl of Hainault (who had married Philip's sister Margaret, the heiress of these provinces) succeeded under the title of Baldwin VIII. The issue of this marriage was the celebrated Baldwin, afterwards emperor of Constantinople. Margaret, the daughter of Lewis II, the last earl of Flanders, married Philip surnamed *the bold*, duke of Burgundy (1369); who, on the death of his father-in-law, succeeded to his dominions (1384).

The first person who appears to have assumed the title of duke of *Brabant* was Henry II (1190): his predecessors, however, had enjoyed a degree of sovereignty in this state ever since the year 978, under the several titles of governors of Lower Lorrain, earls of Lorrain, &c. By the marriage of Winceslaus duke of Luxemburg with Joanna heiress of Brabant, these two duchies were for a time united (1355): but they were again separated on the decease of Winceslaus (1383). When Joanna died (1405) she left her dominions to Anthony, the son of Philip the Bold duke of Burgundy: and his son (named also Philip) dying without issue (1430), they devolved on Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy, the grandson of Philip the Bold.

The first earl of *Luxemburg* was Sigefroy (963); whose descendants bore this title till Winceslaus was created duke by the emperor Charles IV (1354). Elizabeth, the last sovereign of this province, sold it to her cousin Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy (1444).

By this last cession Philip obtained possession of all the provinces on the left bank of the Rhine: and as the Low Countries (as they are sometimes called), and particularly Flanders and Brabant, were then the seat of several considerable manufactories and the centre of European commerce, the *Dukes of Burgundy* considered themselves as equal to any of the powers of Europe; and rivalled even the kings of France*. His grand-daughter Mary, who succeeded her father Charles the Bold in all his dominions (1477), by her marriage with Maximilian, son of the emperor Ferdinand III, in the same year, transferred to the house of Austria the whole of the Netherlands: with the exception of Utrecht, Overyssel, and Groningen. Maximilian was elected emperor of Germany in 1493; and his grandson Charles V, who succeeded him on the imperial throne, afterwards resigned these provinces to his son Philip II, king of Spain (1555).

They remained in possession of the Spaniards till the odious conduct of Philip II excited a general insurrection: at the head of which were the counts Hoorn and Egmont, together with the prince of Orange. The two former were taken and executed; but the prince of Orange, retiring into Holland, maintained a long and doubtful contest against the whole power of Spain. Holland and six of the adjacent provinces entered into a treaty for their mutual defence at Utrecht (1579); whence they assumed the title of the *United Provinces:* and afterwards declared themselves independent (1581). As their efforts were crowned with success, and as their subsequent history thereby becomes detached from the history of the other provinces, it will be pursued in a separate section.—See the next article under the title of HOLLAND.

* See the note in page 64.

After the independence of the Seven United Provinces was acknowledged (1609), the Spaniards remained in possession of the other ten provinces, till the Dutch reduced a considerable part of that country. Their conquests were secured by the treaty of Munster (1648): and, by the Pyrenean treaty (1659), the French were left in possession of part of Artois, Flanders, Hainault, and Luxemburg. Louis XIV afterwards made other conquests in this country, which were confirmed by the treaty of Nimeguen (1678). On the death of Charles II, king of Spain, Flanders again became the seat of war. The memorable victory of Ramillies hastened the conquest of the Netherlands, which were soon after separated for ever from the Spanish crown, and ceded to the house of Austria by the treaty of Utrecht (1713). In the war which broke out between the emperor and France, at the commencement of the late revolution, this country was long the seat of contest between the armies of the two nations. The allies were at length obliged to retreat in all quarters, and the French reduced the whole of the Austrian Netherlands (1794). In the next year, after having subdued the whole country on the left bank of the Rhine, they pushed their conquests into Germany (1795). These, and other victories which soon followed, induced the emperor to withdraw from the contest: and the treaty of Campo Formio secured to France the whole of the Austrian Netherlands. They were then annexed to the French empire, and formed into regular departments, until the deposition of Bonaparte, when by the congress of Vienna (1815) the whole of these provinces, including also Luxemburg, were ceded to the prince of Orange.

HOLLAND.

In the preceding section the early history of this country is brought down to its revolt under the tyranny of the Spanish monarchs (1579). But though these revolters were at first

thought so despicable as to be termed *beggars (gueux)* by their tyrants, their perseverance and courage were such that, under the prince of Orange and the assistance granted them by England, they forced their old masters to declare them a free people, under the title of the *United Provinces*. During this contest, the Dutch (as they were now called) greatly extended their commerce and possessions both in the East Indies and in America; and having stripped the Spaniards of their best establishments in those countries, grew at once into great reputation by their industry, their commerce, and their military exploits. Jealous of their liberties, these republicans, on the death of William II, prince of Orange (1650), abolished the office of stadtholder: but it was again revived in the person of William III (1672). This prince was afterwards chosen king of England (1688); and ruled over both countries at the same time: but, on his death (1702), the office of stadtholder was again abolished in most of the provinces, and was not revived again till the year 1747; when it was declared to be hereditary in the reigning family. The Dutch reduced Mons, Menin, Tournay, and other places in 1706; which were confirmed to them by the treaty of Utrecht (1713), together with some other towns as a barrier.

Soon after the breaking out of the French revolution, the National Convention, suspicious of the views of the stadtholder, declared war against Holland. The French armies under Moreau and Macdonald made an easy conquest of the country (1795): the government was immediately revolutionized; and, the office of stadtholder being abolished for ever, the *Batavian Republic* was established. This new republic, after undergoing several alterations and modifications, was at length destroyed by the intrigues and preponderance of the French. Bonaparte, desirous of creating his brother Louis a sovereign prince, contrived to get him acknowledged and proclaimed *king* of Holland (1806). But this new monarch, having soon after offended his brother, was divested of his dominions, which were immediately annexed to the French empire

(1810). On the deposition of Bonaparte, the prince of Orange was, by the congress of Vienna (1815), re-instated in his dominions, together with the possession of the Netherlands and Luxemburg, under the title of *King of the Netherlands*.

LORRAIN.

THE province of Lorrain, properly so called, is but of small extent. Its early history is involved in that of Gaul, the revolutions of which it underwent till the family of Charlemagne came to the throne of that kingdom. On the division of the French empire between the children of Louis (A.D. 843), that part of the late kingdom of Soissons and Austrasia which was contained between the Rhone, the Saone, the Meuse, the Scheldt, and the Rhine, was allotted (together with Italy) to Lothary: who at his death (855) left this portion of it to his son named also Lothary. Whence it is called, from his own name, Lotharingia; and, by corruption, Lorrain. Soon after the death of Lothary without issue, his two uncles, Louis king of Germany, and Charles the Bald, king of France, seized upon and divided these dominions (870). The former had all the provinces on the right bank of the Rhine together with a part of those on the left: and the latter had the remainder. The sovereignty was, however, often contested between the kings of France and Germany, till Henry, surnamed *the fowler*, obliged the French to cede it to the Germans (921). It was for a long time governed by dukes, appointed by the kings of Germany: and during the reign of Otho the Great it was divided into Upper and Lower Lorrain.

The first *hereditary duke* of Lorrain was Gerhard (1048): whose descendants possessed it till Louis XIV, offended at the conduct of duke Charles, seized on this country (1670); which he held till the peace of Ryswick (1697), when it was restored to the ancient family. By the preliminary treaty of peace

signed in 1735 it was agreed that Francis Stephen, the reigning duke, should exchange this province for the duchy of Tuscany; and that Stanislaus, the new king of Poland, should renounce that kingdom and accept Lorrain as an equivalent; after whose death it was to be for ever united to France. The old duke of Tuscany died in 1737; when Francis Stephen and Stanislaus entered on their respective dominions: and the cession was confirmed by the treaty of Vienna in the following year. Stanislaus died in 1766; when this country, agreeably to the terms of the above treaty, became inseparably annexed to France.

ALSACE.

The early history of this country is also involved in that of Gaul. On the decline of the Roman empire, probably the Alemanni took possession of it: but, if so, they were soon driven out by the Franks. On the division of the French monarchy between the three children of Louis (A.D. 843), Alsace was ceded to Lothary; as mentioned in the preceding section. It was afterwards the subject of contention between the several branches of that family; till, at length, it appears to have been eventually united to Germany (921); and to have been governed for many centuries by dukes, appointed by the emperors, who assumed the title of dukes of Alsace and Suabia. In 1080 this office became hereditary: but on the death of Conradin (1268) the title was abolished. Suabia was then united to the empire.

For many years, however, previous to this event, the provincial counts who governed, under these dukes, in Alsace, assumed the title of landgraves; and the country was divided into Upper and Lower Alsace. The best part of Lower Alsace came eventually into the possession of the bishops of Strasburg (1359); who soon after assumed the title of Landgrave of Alsace (1384). The government of the remaining

part was given by the emperors to several families, till at last Ferdinand I confined it to his own. By the treaty of Westphalia (1648) the emperor Ferdinand III, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the bishop of Strasburg, ceded both Upper and Lower Alsace to the French. The city of Strasburg, however, did not come under their dominion till the year 1681: and it was afterwards formally ceded to them by the treaty of Ryswick.

FRANCE.

The ancient inhabitants of this country were called Gauls. They were a warlike and enterprising people, and often struck terror into the neighbouring states. The first nation, or tribe, which the Romans subdued beyond the Alps was the Salyes, inhabiting the modern Provence (B. C. 118); and from this period the Romans began to extend their conquests by degrees: for, having subdued several of the native tribes in the neighbourhood of their new city of Narbonne, this part of Gaul was reduced to the form of a province, under the name of Gallia Narbonensis. Julius Cæsar, having subjugated the country of the Helvetii (58), next turned his arms against the Belgic provinces, which he soon brought under the dominion of Rome. This gradually led to the conquest of the whole country, which was then reduced to a Roman province (51). The Romans kept possession of Gaul as long as their empire retained its strength, and whilst they were able to repel the incursions of the German nations. But, on the decline of Roman valour and discipline, the Rhine afforded but a feeble barrier against the various tribes that inhabited the opposite banks; and of whose origin or history we have few or no remains.

In A. D. 413 the *Burgundi* seized upon that tract of land which still bears their name, and established a kingdom which,

in the course of twenty years, had extended considerably in France; and by subsequent conquests (460) it became a powerful kingdom. When at its greatest extent, it comprehended all the country which forms the provinces of Burgundy, Lyonnois, Dauphiné, Provence on the north of the Durance, Savoy, the Pays de Vaud, Valais, and part of Switzerland. After subsisting about one hundred and twenty years it was at length conquered by the Franks (534).

In 412 Adolphus, king of the *Visigoths*, established himself in that part of Gaul, situated between the Loire, the Rhone, the Durance, the Alps, and the Mediterranean: Theodoric II made great conquests in Spain (456), and also greatly extended his dominions in France (462). His brother Euric completed the subjugation of Spain (477), with the exception of Galicia. But, in the reign of Alaric II, Clovis king of the Franks reduced great part of their dominions in France (507); and, in the reign of Theudis, the seat of government was transferred into Spain (532). Whereupon, the Franks seized upon the remaining part of the kingdom of the Visigoths, excepting a small tract of land extending along the sea coast from the Pyrenees to the Alps, which remained annexed to the kingdom of the Visigoths in Spain; and which was called Septimania.

Amongst the various German tribes that broke into Gaul, on the downfall of the Roman empire, were the *Franks* under their general Pharamond (420). Gaul was at this time shared between the Romans, the Visigoths, and the Burgundians. Clodio extended his conquests as far as the Somme (445): and Childeric subdued all the country to the Seine (475). Clovis, his successor, having defeated the Roman usurper, Syagrius, who resided at Soissons (486), and having also effected the reduction of the Armorican states* (497), is thus supposed to

* The Armorican States were situate in the north-west angle of France, between the Seine, the Loire, and the ocean: the present Normandy, Bretagne, &c. The tyrant Maximus had settled these provinces

have established the French monarchy. He introduced Christianity in 496: and soon after attacked the dominions of the Visigoths, whose king was slain in the battle which ensued on that occasion (507). On his death (511), his four sons shared the kingdom amongst them: Thierri reigned at *Metz;* Clodomir at *Orleans;* Clotaire at *Soissons;* and Childebert at *Paris:* and each of them assumed the title of king. A division of the empire into so many parts proved the source of various dissentions and civil wars. However, Clotaire assisted his brother Thierri in the conquest of Thuringia, a kingdom in Germany (531). The united forces of these states also completed the reduction of the Burgundi; whose dominions were shared between them (534). Soon after this, they also became possessed of the remnant of the Ostrogothic kingdom in Germany. On the death of Charibert (567), the kingdom of Paris was divided between his brothers; and on the decease of Theodebert II, king of Metz (612), his brother Theodoric II, king of Orleans, succeeded to his dominions; who was in the next year succeeded by Clotaire II, king of Soissons, who thus became sole monarch of France (613).

On the death of Dagobert (638) the kingdom was divided between his two sons Sigebert and Clovis: the former of whom had Austrasia; and the latter, Neustria. Both the kings were minors at the time of their accession, which gave an opportunity to the *mayors of the palace* (the highest officers under the crown) to usurp the whole authority. The kings, in course of time, thus became mere decorated pageants to be shown to the people occasionally. The mayors had the sole power and influence: and their office soon became hereditary. Pepin d'Héristal, mayor of Austrasia, having defeated Bertaire mayor of Neustria (687), united the two kingdoms again in the person of Thierri III. One of the most renowned of

with a colony from Britain (384): but in the year 409, irritated at the neglect of the Roman power, they had formed themselves into an independent republic.

these mayors was Charles Martel, duke of Austrasia (a natural son of Pepin d'Heristal), who reigned as a sovereign: and who, on his death (741), bequeathed his usurped authority to his two sons Carloman and Pepin; the latter of whom had courage and policy to secure himself on the throne, to the exclusion of the Merovingian race. This new monarch, usually known by the name of Pepin *le bref*, having silenced several aspiring nobles who aimed likewise at sovereignty, was solemnly anointed, by direction of the pope, at Soissons (752). Pepin carried the terror of his arms into several of the neighbouring states: he wrested the Exarchate and Pentapolis from the king of Lombardy and gave them to the pope (756); thereby establishing the temporal power of the Apostolic church. He afterwards drove the Saracens out of his kingdom and obliged them to cross the Pyrenees (759): and once more annexed Aquitain* to the crown of France (768). He died in the same year, and was succeeded by his two sons Carloman and Charles; the latter of whom (better known to posterity by the name of Charlemagne) became sole monarch of France on the death of his brother (771).

The reign of CHARLEMAGNE is one of the most splendid in history. Soon after his accession, pope Adrian I. applied to him for protection against the Lombards, who threatened to over-run Italy. Charlemagne sent a large army into the country; took Didier, their king, prisoner; and was himself crowned king of Lombardy (774). He then (as it is affirmed by some) confirmed to the pope the grant, made by his father

* AQUITAIN had been erected into an independent dukedom in favour of Boggis and Bertrand (637), two sons of Charibert king of Toulouse. About the middle of the ninth century the dukes that had been appointed over this province, began to assume independence.

In 1137 Eleanora, the duchess of this province, married Louis VII king of France; and this country became annexed to the crown. But, he having divorced her some time after, she married Henry (1152) afterwards king of England. The whole of this province was seized by the French in 1204: but it was in the course of the same century brought again under the dominion of the English, as will be related in the text.

Pepin, of the Exarchate and Pentapolis; to which he added the patrimonies of the church in the duchies of Spoleto and Beneventum, in Tuscany, Campania, and elsewhere. But the provinces, in which these were situated, continued annexed to the kingdom of Lombardy; and he retained the sovereignty in himself. He next made himself master of Spain as far as the Ebro (778); and annexed Bavaria also to his kingdom (788): he afterwards reduced the Avars or Huns in Pannonia (799). On the death of Adrian, he once more carried his arms into Italy to support the pretensions of the new pope, Leo III; and was there solemnly crowned *emperor of the West* (800). This illustrious prince died in the year 814; after having extended his arms from the Ebro to the Vistula, and from the duchy of Beneventum in Italy to the river Eyder in Denmark. Louis I, surnamed *the mild**, succeeded his father Charlemagne in all his dominions, excepting Italy; and, soon after his accession, divided those dominions amongst the three children by his first wife: which was the source of many troubles and civil wars. These three unnatural sons were soon in arms against their father; and for many years all was confusion and anarchy. At length on the death of Louis a new division of the empire was proposed; which, after much contention, was settled by the treaty of Verdun (843) in the following manner. Lothary was to have Italy, with the imperial dignity †, and the countries situate between the Rhone, the Saone, the Meuse, the Scheldt, and the Rhine; Louis had all the provinces on the right side of the Rhine, together with some few cities on the left side of it; and (Pepin being dead) Charles,

* He is called Louis *le debonnaire* by the French writers: but by the English he is styled sometimes Louis *the pious*, and at other times Louis *the mild*. These *nick-names* (they deserve no better title) oftentimes mislead the reader.

† The title of *emperor of the West* was for a long time enjoyed by various branches of the family of Charlemagne, without any regard to the state which they governed: and it was not confined to the sovereigns of *Germany* till the reign of Otho the Great in 962.

another son of Louis the mild by a second wife, retained the remaining provinces of Neustria and Aquitain.

Thus Charles, afterwards called *the bald*, became the successor of Louis the mild in France; and here properly begins the history of modern *France*, which was thus dismembered from the ancient kingdom of the Franks. For, although various parts of the empire were sometimes united under one crown, during the existence of the family of Charlemagne, yet as these were only temporary events, and not attended with any important results, they are overlooked in this general view of the subject. During the confusion which attended the reign of his successor many important provinces were lost to France. Boson (who married the widow of Charles the bald, and afterwards the daughter of the emperor Louis II,) seized upon Provence * and assumed the title of king (880). Switzerland also and part of Savoy were separated from the monarchy, and erected into an independent state by count Rodolph, who assumed the title of king of Burgundy Transjuran (888). The repeated invasions likewise of the *Normans*, under their celebrated chief Rollo, at length obliged Charles III, surnamed *the simple*, to cede to him, as a fief of the crown, part of Neustria, which henceforward took the name of Normandy (912) †.

The last prince of the race of Charlemagne was Louis V, who died in 987. Towards the end of this period a new kind of possession was established in France under the name of

* The kingdom of PROVENCE comprehended not only the country between the Rhone and the Alps, including part of Savoy, but also Franche Comté, Lyonnois, and other places. It did not exist long as a separate state, for it was at length ceded to Rodolph II, king of Burgundy Transjuran (933).—See page 64.

† William II, duke of NORMANDY, invaded England (1066), and conquered the whole country. On his death (1087) Normandy was seized by his eldest son Robert: but Henry I, taking advantage of his absence in the crusades, united it again to the crown of England (1106). It was afterwards reduced by Geoffrey, count of Anjou (1144), the father of Henry II, who succeeded him in his dominions (1151).

Fief. The dukes or governors of provinces, the earls or governors of cities, and other inferior officers, profiting by the weakness of the royal authority, rendered hereditary in their own family the titles which hitherto they held only for life; and usurped not only the lands but the government of the same: whereby the royal domain was reduced to a very narrow compass. It comprehended scarcely more than Paris, Orleans, Etamps, Compiègne, Melun, Bruges, and a few other places. The rest was held by the vassals of the king; who in truth rendered him homage for the same, but were, notwithstanding, complete sovereigns in their own provinces; and carried on war against each other at pleasure. Hugh Capet, one of the most powerful of these nobles, seized this opportunity of mounting the throne; and commenced a new dynasty, to the exclusion of the Carlovingian race. In 1152, Henry Plantagenet duke of Normandy and count of Anjou and Maine *, by his marriage with Eleanora, the duchess of Aquitain and the divorced wife of Louis VII, united all these provinces in his own person: so that, on his succession to the crown of England (1154), he was as powerful in France as the king himself. But his son king John was adjudged to have forfeited all his dominions in that kingdom: and Philip II took possession of them accordingly (1204), except Guienne. Louis IX, however, whose character stands so high for integrity, candour, and justice, restored to the English crown the provinces of Querci, Perigord, and Limousin, in lieu of all right to the forfeited dominions (1259).

The Capetingian race of monarchs ended in 1328; and two powerful competitors disputed their right to the vacant throne: Philip de Valois, the grandson of Philip III; and Edward III king of England, in right of his mother Isabella the daughter

* The first count of Maine was Gauzbert, about the year 841: and the first count of Anjou was Ingelger in 870. Fulco V inherited Maine in right of his wife (1110). And Geoffrey seized upon Normandy in right of his wife Maud (1144). His son Henry Plantagenet succeeded him in all these dominions (1151).

of Philip IV. The nobility raised Philip to the throne; and hostilities soon commenced between the two monarchs. The English triumphed over the French at the battle of Cressy (1346), where artillery was first used: and, after a long siege, they took Calais (1347), which remained in their hands two hundred and ten years. By the treaty of Bretigny (1360), the French king ceded in full sovereignty Poitou, Saintonge, L'Angenois, Rovergue, L'Angoumois, Querci, Perigord, Limousin, and other districts in that quarter; together with Calais, Guisnes, Montreuil, and the county of Ponthieu, on the other side of France; in lieu of all other claims. In the mean time Humbert the last earl of DAUPHINE' resigned his dominions and authority into the hands of Charles, grandson of Philip VI king of France: whence this fief on the death of Humbert in 1355 became re-united to the crown; and the eldest sons of the kings of France have ever since retained the title of *Dauphin*. Tranquillity and good order were restored by the prudence of Charles V, and war was soon renewed between France and England (1370). The French were victorious in almost every action, and in the course of a few years the English were stript of all their dominions in France, except Bourdeaux, Bayonne, and Calais (1377): but Henry V, king of England, seized the opportunity of subsequent troubles to invade France; and the battle of Agincourt was the prelude to future victories (1415). He subdued the greatest part of the kingdom, and by the treaty of Troyes (1420) was appointed regent of the kingdom and successor to the throne. But, soon after the death of Charles VII, the zeal and activity of the nation were roused by the enthusiasm of the *Maid of Orleans* (1429): and in the course of fifteen years the English were expelled from many of their possessions in France. On the rupture of the truce in 1448, the arms of France were again successful; and the English were, before the year 1453, deprived of all their dominions, excepting Calais. His successor Louis XI, on the death of Charles duke of Burgundy

(1477), laid claim to Burgundy*, Franche Comté, Artois, and several other places; which proved the source of new wars that long desolated the Netherlands, and bred an implacable hatred between the houses of France and Austria. In the year 1481 Louis seized likewise upon the county of Provence, which had formerly made part of the kingdom of Provence; and which, on the extinction of that monarchy, had also assumed independence, and cast off its allegiance to the empire.

The house of Valois terminated by the assassination of Henry III (1599). He was succeeded by Henry IV, king of Navarre, and the first of the *House of Bourbon*, who changed his religion to secure the throne. Nevertheless he maintained the protestants in the free exercise of their religious tenets, by publishing the celebrated Edict of Nantes (1598): which however was revoked by Louis XIV (1685). In the early part of the reign of this monarch Roussillon was conquered from the Spaniards (1642), who had held it, from the year 1172, under the kings of Arragon. The unbounded ambition of this sovereign rendered him odious to every prince in Europe; and several long and bloody wars ensued: during which, Germany, the Netherlands, and the frontiers of Spain and Italy were at once the theatres of hostilities. The alterations of territory which were produced by these contests, as well as by the sub-

* The first duke of Burgundy was Richard, towards the end of the ninth century. Like the other great fiefs in France, it soon became independent of the crown. It never formed part of the kingdom of Burgundy.—See what has been already said in page 51.

The county of Burgundy, or Franche-Comte', was formerly part of the kingdom of Arles or Provence: and soon after the extinction of that monarchy the governors assumed independence, and took the title of Earls of Burgundy. In 1385 Philip the Bold, duke of Burgundy, succeeded to this earldom in right of his wife Margaret: and both these countries were claimed by Louis.

Charles VIII, however, although he seized upon Franche-Comté, was obliged to give up his claim on the duchy of Burgundy; but it was eventually reduced by Louis XIV in 1674.

sequent operations of the French in America, will be related under their respective heads in the course of this work.

The progress of philosophy and freedom of thinking which had been much encouraged in France during the latter part of the last century; together with the new ideas of government which had been formed in their recent alliance with America; prepared the way for a *Revolution* in that country which has been attended with consequences the most astonishing of any recorded in history. The more immediate cause however of this surprising event arose from the derangement of the finances; and from the measures taken by Louis XVI to redress this serious evil. The populace, suspicious of the king's intentions, rose against the lawful authorities, demolished the Bastile (July 14, 1789), and set bounds to the prerogative of their sovereign. The National Assembly sided with the people, and immediately commenced the establishment of a new order of things; whereby it was intended that every trace of the ancient regime should be wholly buried in oblivion. The religious orders were abolished: titles of nobility were suppressed: and the king himself at length made prisoner (1791). About the same time were formed several dangerous republican factions, whose frequent meetings and violent declarations overawed the National Assembly, and involved France in anarchy and bloodshed. The most numerous, as well as the most daring of these clubs, was that of the Jacobins; whose influence and intrigues procured the deposition of the king (Aug. 10, 1792), and afterwards his decapitation (Jan. 21, 1793).

In the meantime many of the clergy and nobility, together with numbers of other persons attached to the ancient order of things, had fled from France for fear of personal danger. A powerful body was thus collected on the frontiers, who were assisted by the surrounding nations in their efforts to re-establish royalty and tranquillity. This was the origin of the *first* of a series of *coalitions* against France; into which nearly all the powers of Europe have successively entered. The first

campaign was unfortunate to France. But, in the following years these losses were retrieved by the conquest of the Netherlands and Holland. The Republic having made peace with several of the German princes, turned her views towards Italy. The command of the army was given to general *Bonaparte* (30th March 1796), then a young man of about twenty-six years of age; and one of the most astonishing characters that ever existed in this or any other country. He had distinguished himself at the siege of Toulon; and afterwards married the discarded mistress of his friend Barras the Director, his patron on this occasion. By a series of brilliant and rapid victories this extraordinary man retrieved the affairs of France; and eventually obliged the Austrians to sign the treaty of Campo Formio (1797): by which the conquests of the French in the Netherlands were confirmed, and the Milanese ceded to the new Cisalpine republic: whilst the Venetian territories were given up to the Austrians.

In the *second coalition* (1799), the republicans were every where unfortunate: and the united forces of the Austrians and Russians threatened the very frontiers of France; whilst the ill conduct of the Directory at home brought the country to the brink of ruin. At this crisis, Bonaparte returned from Egypt; and, after abolishing the Directory, procured himself to be elected *First Consul* (Nov. 10, 1799). From this moment the affairs of France took a different turn. By his activity and enterprising genius he overcame the intrigues of all his rivals: he introduced a new order of things in the different departments of state: he suppressed the various factions that had so long raged in the empire; and, by the reformation of many abuses, restored order and tranquillity in the government. After this, he put himself at the head of the French army; and, having effected the celebrated passage of mount St. Bernard, gained the ever memorable battle of Marengo (June 14, 1800), the prelude to future victories. These, and other successes, led the way to the peace of Luneville (1801), and afterwards to the peace of Amiens (1802): and thus

Europe, for the first time since the late revolution, enjoyed the blesings of universal peace.

This pacific period, however, was but of short duration. The ambition of Bonaparte, now chosen Consul for life (Aug. 4, 1802), exceeded all bounds, and gave rise to the *third coalition*, which was afterwards joined (1805) by Austria, Russia, and Sweden. The *emperor Napoleon** immediately put himself at the head of the French army; and, having carried his rapid and victorious arms through the heart of Austria, forced the sovereign of that country to abandon his metropolis. The dreadful battle of Austerlitz (Dec. 2) completed the ruin of the confederacy, and brought about the peace of Presburg; by which, Austria ceded to the French the Venetian teritories which she had gained by the treaty of Campo Formio, and submitted to other humiliating conditions.

In the following year (1806) several of the German states formed amongst themselves a new alliance, called the Confederation of the Rhine, and chose the French emperor as their Protector. This vast acquisition of power was the cause of new jealousies, and hastened the *fourth coalition* between Russia and Prussia. In less than three weeks the French emperor, with his usual good fortune, gained the memorable battles of Jena (Oct. 13) and Erfurth; and entered the capital of Berlin as a conqueror (Oct. 27). In the following year he beat the Russian army at Prussian Eylau (Feb. 8, 1807) and at Friedland (June 14); and forced them to retire to the Tilsit river, where an amicable meeting took place between the emperors of France and Russia (June 25). Separate treaties of peace were afterwards signed with Russia and with Prussia. The Russian empire gained a small acquisition of territory by this treaty: but the king of Prussia was obliged to make considerable sacrifices, in order to save the remnant of his kingdom.

* Bonaparte was declared *emperor of the French* on the 18th of May 1804; and the imperial dignity was conferred on him and his successors.

Elevated by his astonishing successes, the French emperor appeared to consider himself as sovereign of Europe, and not only to disregard the common rights of mankind, but likewise to set at defiance all principles of justice and moderation. By a single decree he deprived kings of their legal territories, or even of their crowns; and bestowed these possessions on new princes and new sovereigns created at his pleasure. The most atrocious act of this kind, was the recent attack upon the liberties of Spain (1808), which excited a violent spirit of opposition in that country. Great Britain and Austria assisted the cause of the Spanish patriots, and thus excited what the French call the *fifth coalition*. The efforts of Austria, it is too well known, were ineffectual: and the defeat of the Austrians at the battle of Wagram (July 6, 1809) obliged them to sign the treaty of Schonbrun (Oct. 14); and thereby make new sacrifices to their natural enemies.

The principal object which Bonaparte has had in view, during the whole course of the war with England, being the destruction of her commerce, he has always made it a condition with his allies that their ports shall be shut against the British. Russia, being a maritime and commercial nation, refused to accede to this measure: and hostilities were soon renewed between these powers. Early in the spring of 1812, an immense army was collected in Poland, with a view to intimidate the emperor Alexander: but that monarch, encouraged by the patriotic and zealous exertions of his people, resolved to dispute the subject with the sword. Bonaparte declared war on the 22d of June; and, within three days, passed the Russian frontiers at Kowno. His march was directed towards Moscow, the ancient capital of the empire; and was every where marked with desolation and with blood. Even the dreadful battle of Borodino (Sept. 7)*, one of the most fatal and destructive in modern history, did not stop his sanguinary career. With rapid strides he hastened towards

* By the French, called the *battle of Moskwa*.

Moscow, which the Russians had previously evacuated, and nearly reduced to ashes (Sept. 14). Here the haughty conqueror imagined that he should become the arbiter of the whole Russian empire; and that he should be able to prescribe to it such a peace as he should think proper. But, finding himself thwarted in this object, and that the Russian generals were concentrating their forces around him, he thought it most prudent to evacuate Moscow (Oct. 19), and retreat towards the frontiers: and here began that series of disasters which led to the almost complete destruction of the French invading army, and eventually to his own deposition: for, in the following year the emperor Alexander followed up his successes, and the allied armies entered France in all directions. On the 31st of March 1814 they entered Paris; and having procured the dethronement of Bonaparte (the object of all their labours) they caused the return of Louis XVIII to the throne of his ancestors. The mighty empire which had been raised by the French has crumbled into dust: and the first object of the allied monarchs has been to re-establish the ancient order of things. The island of Elba was appointed as the residence of Bonaparte, with the title of emperor.

A general congress was immediately assembled at Vienna (1815) to arrange and finally settle the affairs of Europe. But whilst the crowned heads were deliberating on these measures, Bonaparte, dissatisfied with his situation, made another effort to regain the throne of France: and landing at Frejus (March 3) he marched with a handful of men and without opposition to Paris, where he was again declared emperor. The subsequent battle of Waterloo (June 18) destroyed however all his hopes; and he soon after surrendered himself to the British, who have sent him as an exile to the island of St. Helena. Louis XVIII therefore was again put in possession of the brittle sceptre of this country.

SWITZERLAND.

The ancient inhabitants of this country were the Helvetii, who were brought under the dominion of the Romans by Julius Cæsar (B.C. 58); and who continued subject to them till the decline of the western empire, when the emperor Honorius permitted the Alemanni, a German nation, to occupy the greatest part of the country (A.D. 400). They were eventually deprived of all their possessions by Clovis, king of the Franks (496). The remaining part of the country was occupied by the Burgundi, who were also driven out by the Franks (534). It remained subject to them till the division of their empire between the children of Louis the mild (843); when this country formed part of the dominions that were allotted to his eldest son Lothary. After some slight changes, which it would be tedious here to enumerate, it was eventually erected into an independent kingdom, on the death of Charles the fat, by Rodolph; who assumed the title of king of *Burgundy Transjuran* (888). About half a century after that period, this kingdom was enlarged by the acquisition of Provence; which was ceded to Rodolph II by Hugh, surnamed *the great* (933): and the union of these two monarchies formed the new kingdom of *Arles* *; which subsisted about a hundred years. Rodolph III, the last sovereign of this kingdom, but whose power had been considerably reduced by his discontented vassals, left all his possessions, by will, to the emperor Conrad II; who, on the death of Rodolph (1032), laid his claim thereto accordingly.

The barons of this kingdom, however, had rendered themselves too independent of their monarch to submit to a new master: and from its ruins arose a number of petty states,

* His descendants took the title sometimes of kings of *Burgundy*, sometimes kings of *Vienne* or *Arles*, and sometimes kings of *Provence and Alemannia*.

who for some time acknowledged the sovereignty of the German emperors, and who were governed by officers of the imperial court, sent oftentimes more for the sake of enriching themselves, than of administering justice, or attending to the cares and wants of an enlightened people. But, at length, the cantons of Schwitz, Uri, and Underwald, (being treated in an arbitrary and tyrannical manner by the emperor Albert I) were, through the independent spirit of *William Tell* and the bold and enterprising measures of a few private citizens, delivered from the imperial yoke (1308). They entered into a common league for their defence; and by the battle of Morgant established the liberties of Switzerland. Other cantons occasionally joined this league; but some of them not till near two centuries afterwards. By the year 1353, Zurich, Glaris, Zug, and Berne, had united themselves to it; Friburg and Soleure in 1481; Basle and Scaffhausen in 1501; and Appenzel in 1513. This last completed the confederacy, whose united efforts repeatedly defeated the combined powers of France and Germany: till the thirteen Swiss Cantons were declared by treaty to be a free and independent state.

Soon after the breaking out of the commotions in France, the Directory marched an army into their territories, and obliged them to accept the new *Helvetic constitution* (1798). From this period the affairs of Switzerland have been involved in much confusion: various plans and forms of government had been proposed and adopted; each of which (as might be expected) led to new disturbances. At length Bonaparte, under pretence of mediating between the hostile parties, imposed on them a new constitution (1803): and this country, like the greatest part of the continent, was considered as dependent on France, until the deposition of Bonaparte (1814), when it regained its former state of independence.

SAVOY AND PIEDMONT.

THIS country was probably reduced by the Romans at the same time with Cisalpine Gaul (B.C. 222). It passed from their dominion to that of the Alemanni or Burgundi (A.D. 400), who were afterwards driven out by the Franks (496); and underwent the revolutions related in the preceding article till the extinction of the kingdom of Arles (1032), when the sovereignty of this country was claimed by the emperors of Germany: and Henry V conferred the title of *count* of Savoy on Amadeus (1111).

The emperor Sigismund bestowed the title of *duke* of Savoy and Piedmont on Amadeus VIII (1417); which has ever since been retained by his successors. The French afterwards reduced several places in this country (1535). But duke Emanuel Philibert, at the head of the confederates, having gained the battle of St. Quentin (1557), obliged the French monarch (1559) to restore most of his conquests: the remainder were ceded by Henry III (1574). By the treaty of Utrecht (1713) Sicily was united to this country, together with the title of *king:* and Victor Amadeus was crowned king of Sicily in the same year. But this monarch afterwards exchanged Sicily with the emperor, for the island of Sardinia (1718): and his descendants have ever since borne the title of *kings of Sardinia.*

Soon after the commencement of the late revolution in France, the French reduced Savoy, and annexed it to the republic, under the title of the department of Mont Blanc (1792). Within two years they again declared war against this country. Unable to oppose the force that was sent against him, Charles Emanuel IV made a formal surrender of his continental dominions; and having agreed to retire to the island of Sardinia (1798), the whole of this country became incorporated with France. On the deposition of Bonaparte, how-

ever, these dominions were restored by the congress of Vienna (1815) to the king of Sardinia, together with the republic of Genoa.

GENOA.

This territory was part of the ancient Liguria: but the æra of its foundation, as a state, is not known. It was eventually brought under the power of the Romans, probably about the year B.C. 222, and underwent all the revolutions of Gallia Cisalpina, till it was annexed to the Eastern empire by Narses (A.D. 553). It continued subject to that power till Rotharis, king of Lombardy, reduced it (641), and formed it into a provincial dukedom: but, on the destruction of that monarchy by Charlemagne, it fell under the dominion of the Franks (774). Genoa was at this time distinguished for its wealth and power: nevertheless its history, for nearly three centuries after this period, is scarcely known. Having become independent of the Franks (but at what period, is not precisely known), the Genoese formed themselves into a republic; and were at first governed by *consuls*, freely chosen by the people (950); and afterwards by a *doge* or duke (1190). They extended their commerce over the known world, and rose to great eminence and reputation.

From the year 1353 to 1528, however, we find that the country was in a very convulsed state, and became the prey not only of civil discord, but also of foreign invasion and conquest. It was during these contests that *Andrew Doria*, a Genoese admiral, rescued his country from the dominion of foreign power (1528), restored it to its liberty, and laid the foundation of the present *republic*. It has since continued to preserve its liberty, till the period of the late revolution in France; when the political constitution of this country was totally subverted. By the force and intrigues of the French republicans, it was changed into what was afterwards called

the *Ligurian republic* (1797); which was to be governed in a manner similar to their own; but it was afterwards thought proper to annex it to the French empire (1805). On the deposition of Bonaparte it was given by the congress of Vienna (1815) to the king of Sardinia, with the title of duke.

VENICE.

The original inhabitants of this country were the Veneti, who were conquered by the Romans about the year B.C. 222. It afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the Roman empire till about the middle of the fifth century, when such of the inhabitants as escaped the general slaughter, occasioned by the frequent invasions of the Huns and other hostile nations, fled to the islands on their coast, and there took up their residence (A.D. 452). They founded the present city of Venice, formed themselves into a republic, and soon became masters of a fleet and a body of land forces.

We find but little worth recording in the history of Venice till the year 697: at that time the tribunes having abused their power, a *doge* or duke was elected in their stead; and in him was vested the supreme authority. Although situated in a manner on the ocean, and perhaps not altogether independent of the several powers that successively bore sway in the north of Italy*, this republic in course of time enlarged their territories by the conquest of Istria, Dalmatia, and Croatia (997). In the quarrel between the emperor Frederic I and pope Alexander III, the latter, in order to avoid the resentment of Frederic, took shelter in Venice: an event that involved them in a war with Germany. The imperial fleet, which threatened the very existence of Venice, was totally defeated by the doge Sebastiano Ziani (1177):

* This is presumed to be the case on the chart.

and, in commemoration of this event, the pope presented Ziani with a ring to be thrown into the sea as a testimony of his dominion over it: a ceremony which is annually performed to the present day.

When the Latins made themselves masters of Constantinople (1204), the Venetians (who had rendered them essential service) were rewarded, as their share of the plunder, with the sea coast of the Morea and some of the islands contiguous thereto, together with several cities on the coast of Phrygia. They afterwards purchased Candia from the marquis of Montferrat. In 1405 the Venetians conquered Verona, Padua, and other cities in Italy: and soon after obliged the duke of Milan to cede to them successively several other districts on the continent. The last of these conquests was made in the year 1454. The Venetian territories were also further enlarged by several subsequent conquests; and more particularly by the acquisition of Cyprus, on the death of James king of that island (1475). After the destruction of the Eastern empire, the Turks began to interfere with the affairs of this state. Long and obstinate contests with this new enemy impaired the resources of the country and hastened its fall. But what contributed most of all to the decline of this republic was the discovery of a passage to the East Indies, by the Cape of Good Hope (1497). For, hitherto, the greatest part of the East India goods imported into Europe was brought up the Red Sea and across the land to Alexandria; whence they were distributed through the other countries by the Venetians. But as soon as the discovery above mentioned took place, the carriage by this route almost entirely ceased.

In their subsequent wars with the Turks, they lost all their possessions in the Morea, and the islands that they held in the Archipelago (1540); together with Cyprus (1571) and Candia (1645), as will be related in the history of those countries. The Venetians afterwards recovered the Morea and several other places. But the Turks, soon after, drove

the Venetians out of these possessions (1715). Since this period no essential alteration has taken place in the Venetian affairs till the invasion of Italy by the French; who, having reduced it, ceded it to Austria (1797): but the Austrians were compelled to restore it to the French by the peace of Presburg (1805); and it formed part of the new kingdom of Italy, till the deposition of Bonaparte, when it was given up again by the congress of Vienna (1815) to the Austrians.

MODENA.

This country was part of Gallia Cisalpina, which submitted to the Roman arms in the year B. C. 222. It underwent all the revolutions of their empire, and of the kingdom of Lombardy, till the extinction of the family of Charlemagne in Italy. Soon after this period, we find Azzo, prince of Esté, in possession of these states (A.D. 926): and although the Germans, for many years, asserted their title to this country (in common with the rest of the north of Italy), yet the government has remained in his family ever since. In 1452 the emperor Frederic III conferred on Borso the title of *duke* of Modena and Reggio; to which pope Paul II added that of Ferrara (1471).

He and his successors held these and other territories in Italy till the death of Alphonso II, the fifth duke, without issue (1597): when pope Clement VIII seized on Ferrara and added it to the ecclesiastical states. The other possessions were conferred by the emperor Rodolph II on Cæsar of Esté, whose family held them till the period of the late conquests of the French in this country (1796); when they were reduced and united to the new Cisalpine republic, afterwards the kingdom of Italy. But on the deposition of Bonaparte they were restored by the congress of Vienna (1815) to the family of Esté.

MANTUA AND MONTFERRAT.

This country also was part of Gallia Cisalpina, which was conquered by the Romans about the year B. C. 222; and underwent all the revolutions of their empire, and of the kingdom of Lombardy, till the extinction of the family of Charlemagne in Italy. After this, Mantua was governed in the form of a republic under the protection of the emperors; till Otho II gave it to Theobald, one of the ancient family of Esté (A.D. 980); still, however, subject to the dominion of the empire: and in this state it continued till about the middle of the thirteenth century. In the meantime, however, the celebrated Matilda, who held these dominions, left them by will to the pope: but the emperor disputed her right so to do, and maintained that the sovereignty rested in himself. This contest increased the animosity which already subsisted between these two monarchs.

Lewis de Gonzaga, having suppressed the rival factions and triumphed over his enemies, at length established himself in the government of the state with the title of *captain* (1328). His descendant, John Francis, was invested with the title of *marquis*, by the emperor Sigismund (1433): and the emperor Charles V created Frederic II *duke* of Mantua (1530); to which he afterwards added the title of marquis of Montferrat (1536), a country which had acquired independence about the same time as Mantua. On the death of Charles IV the last duke of Mantua (1708), the imperial troops seized on this country, and it thus became annexed to the Austrian dominions; in which state it remained till it was conquered by Bonaparte: when it was given up, at the treaty of Campo Formio (1797), by the Austrians, in order to form part of the Cisalpine republic, afterwards the new kingdom of Italy. But on the deposition of Bonaparte, it was ceded by the congress of Vienna (1815) to Austria.

MILAN.

This country was anciently called Insubria, which was seized by the Gauls about the commencement of the sixth century before Christ: whence, the northern part of Italy was called Gallia Cisalpina. It was afterwards reduced by the Romans (B.C. 222), and underwent all the revolutions of their empire in Italy till the Ostrogoths, who had obtained possession of it, were driven out by Narses, under the reign of the emperor Justinian (A.D. 553). Italy was then annexed to the Greek empire, and governed by Narses under the title of duke; till that general, offended at the conduct of the empress Sophia, invited the Lombards into the country. Alboinus, their chief, consented; and proceeded towards Italy with his whole nation, their wives and children, carrying with them their moveables and every thing of value (568). In the course of two years he extended his conquests over great part of the peninsula, and afterwards reduced the duchy of Beneventum in the south (572). Astulphus, one of his successors, invaded the imperial possessions, entered the Exarchate at the head of a considerable army, took Ravenna, and subdued the whole province, together with Pentapolis; which he added to the kingdom of the Lombards (753). But Pepin, king of France, entering Italy with a large army, obliged Astulphus to give up the conquered territories, and bestowed them on the pope (756).

Charlemagne afterwards put an end to the kingdom of the Lombards (774), and caused himself to be crowned king of Lombardy at Milan; and thus united Lombardy to the French empire. When the division of the empire of Charlemagne was finally settled between his three grandsons, by the treaty of Verdun (843), the kingdom of Italy was given to Lothary: but soon after his decease the possession of the sovereignty was warmly contested by the dukes of Friuli and Spoleto: till at length the emperor Otho I, having deposed Berenger II, was crowned king of Italy (952): and though that monarch was

restored soon afterwards, yet it was a second time reduced by Otho (962) and annexed to the empire of Germany. On his departure from Italy, Otho left some of the cities free, but all of them tributary; and he appointed several hereditary marquises and counts to govern them, reserving to himself the sovereign jurisdiction in their territories. But though the Italian states thus acknowledged the dominion of the emperors, they generally revolted at the beginning of every new reign; and through this mutual contest for power, they long became the seat of faction, intrigue and war*.

Towards the close of this long and troublesome interval, many of the Italian cities entered into a confederacy for the protection of their liberties and independence against the encroachments of the empire: and, on the extinction of the house of Suabia (1254), the imperial interest was ruined in this country. Some of the states assumed independence and defied the power of the empire; whilst others obtained their liberty by the silent, though equally effective, method of purchase. The feeble efforts of the emperor Henry VII did not restore the imperial authority amongst them. He confirmed the family of the Visconti in the government of Milan, and satisfied himself with the nominal sovereignty. This family soon became very powerful, and subdued many of the neighbouring states. At length the emperor Winceslaus, for a sum of money, created John Galeazzo, of the family of the Visconti, *duke* of Milan (1395); and in the following year ceded to him the sovereignty of almost all the imperial cities in Lombardy.

This family having become extinct, Louis XII put in his claim, in right of his mother Valentina, and at length seized on the country (1500). He possessed it but a short time:

* In the chart, the whole of the north of Italy is represented as belonging to the Germans, from the year 952 to the middle of the thirteenth century. It is impossible to insert therein all the changes and revolutions which took place, without confusing the whole plan. It may however be done, by the reader, in a distinct and separate chart for this portion of history.

for Maximilian Sforza drove the French out of Italy and regained his capital (1512). The French, however, again reduced it in the reign of Francis I (1515): but Francis Sforza, the son of Maximilian, regained possession of it (1521). On the death of Francis Sforza without issue (1535), the emperor Charles V seized Milan as an imperial fief; and granted the investiture of it to his son Philip II king of Spain. In his family it remained till the death of Charles II (1700); when the imperialists made themselves masters of all the Spanish dominions in Italy (1706).

It remained in possession of this family till the late conquests of the French in Italy, when the inhabitants of the several neighbouring states formed themselves into the *Cisalpine republic* (1797), under the protection of France. Soon after the elevation of Bonaparte to the imperial dignity this republic was abolished, and the new *kingdom of Italy* was erected in its stead (1805). But soon after his deposition this country together with nearly the whole of Lombardy was given by the congress of Vienna (1815) to the house of Austria.

PARMA AND PLACENTIA.

This country was also part of Gallia Cisalpina, and was conquered by the Romans about the year B.C. 222. It afterwards underwent all the revolutions of their empire and of the kingdom of Lombardy till it was conquered by Charlemagne (A.D. 774). Soon after the extinction of his family, we find Theobald created lord of Parma and Placentia (980) by the emperor Otho II. But though it probably acknowledged the sovereignty of the emperors as long as their influence remained in Italy, yet we hear little more of it till the middle of the fourteenth century, when the duke of Milan seized it, and it then continued an appendage to that state till 1512, when the emperor Maximilian seized it and gave it to the Holy See.

Pope Paul III made over these states to his son Peter Louis Farnese, with the title of *duke* (1545): and his descendants held them till the decease of Anthony, who died without issue (1731). Don Carlos, son of Philip V king of Spain, then took possession of this duchy; but afterwards ceded it to the emperor (1737). In 1748 it was given to Don Philip, brother of Don Carlos.

His son Ferdinand succeeded him (1765): but by a treaty between France and Spain it was agreed that, on the death of Ferdinand, these duchies should be united to France. This event happened on the 9th of October, 1802: and the states were formally annexed to the French empire on the 24th of May, 1808. On the deposition of Bonaparte these states were given by the congress of Vienna (1815) to the ex-empress Maria Louisa*.

TUSCANY.

This country formed a considerable part of ancient Etruria. After a ten years siege, Camillus took the celebrated city of Veii, and thereby reduced the greatest part of the country (B.C. 396): the remainder, after much contest, was entirely subdued in the year 280. It afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the Roman empire; and, on the decline of that power, formed part of the kingdom of the Lombards, which successively submitted to the French and the Germans, as related in the preceding articles.

It was afterwards governed by *dukes* appointed by the emperors; and soon became involved in all those civil commotions, excited by the papal and imperial factions, which raged so furiously throughout the whole of Italy. The cities of

* Although this is called an independent state, yet, to avoid confusion on the chart, it is represented as belonging to the house of Austria.

Florence, Pisa*, and Sienna, profiting by these dissensions, withdrew themselves from the dominion of both, and formed themselves into separate commonwealths. In the republic of Florence John de Medicis, a popular nobleman, eventually insinuated himself so much into the favour of his countrymen that they invested him with sovereign power: he died in A.D. 1428. His memory is rendered dear to posterity as the founder of the family of the Medicis; who, by employing their vast fortunes in the improvement of their country, in acts of public munificence, and in the cultivation of the sciences and useful arts, promoted and encouraged the revival of learning in Europe, after a long period of ignorance and darkness. Pope Pius V conferred the title of *grand duke* of Tuscany on Cosmo the Great (1569). In this family the duchy remained till the death of John Gaston de Medicis, without issue (1737): when it was transferred to the duke of Lorrain, afterwards the emperor Francis I, in lieu of the duchy of Lorrain.

It continued in possession of the Austrian family till the period of its occupation by the French: and by the treaty of Luneville (1801) the archduke Ferdinand renounced his right and title. The country was then bestowed upon Louis the hereditary prince of Parma, under the title of the *kingdom of Etruria;* by virtue of a treaty (signed March 21) between France and Spain. His reign was but short, as he died in 1803; and left the kingdom to his son Louis II, under the regency of his widow Maria Louisa. She was compelled to cede the new monarchy to the French: and in the following year it was formally united to the French empire. But, by a recent decree (March 3, 1809) it has been again erected into a grand duchy, and bestowed on the princess Elisa, sister of the French emperor. On the deposition of Bonaparte, it was restored by the congress of Vienna (1815) to the archduke Ferdinand.

* Pisa soon rose to great eminence as a commercial nation: and its alliance was courted by several neighbouring states. It was at length reduced by the Florentines (1406): and though the country revolted in 1494, it was again reduced in 1509. Sienna was conquered by Charles V in 1554; who gave it to Cosmo in 1557.

UMBRIA.

THIS country was anciently inhabited by the Umbri, who formerly possessed the greatest part of Italy; but who were gradually reduced to their natural limits by the neighbouring states. In the year B.C. 397, the Gauls seized part of this country; but they were afterwards dispossessed by the Romans (307), who soon after conquered the remaining part (290). Umbria then underwent all the revolutions of the Roman empire, till Italy was invaded by the Lombards; who erected it into a dukedom (A.D. 570): which was afterwards reduced by Charlemagne (774). On the abdication of Charles the fat (888), Guy duke of Spoleto disputed the sovereignty of Italy with Berenger duke of Friuli: and this country was for several years, on account of these rival claims, the scene of desolation and war, till the victorious arms of the emperor Otho I restored a temporary peace to the country (952).

About the middle of the thirteenth century the state of *Urbino* rose into notice. In 1474 pope Sextus IV conferred the title of *duke* on Frederic, the governor of that province: whose lineal descendent, Francis Mary, dying without issue (1631), left his possessions to the Holy See: and pope Urban VIII took possession of them accordingly. This country afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the papal territories, till their final annexation to the French empire (1809). On the deposition, however, of Bonaparte they were restored by the congress of Vienna (1815) to the Pope.

FERRARA, ROMAGNA, &c.

THIS country was formerly inhabited by the Lingones, and was conquered by the Romans in the year B.C. 266. It afterwards underwent all the revolutions of their empire till the reign

of Honorius, who removed the seat of government from Rome to Ravenna, the capital of the province of Romagna (A.D. 404): and which ever after was the metropolis of the Roman empire in the west. But that empire, reduced now to the narrow limits of Italy, being overturned by the Heruli (476), and afterwards by the Ostrogoths (493), was again united to the Eastern empire by the victorious arms of Narses (553); and was governed by an imperial officer styled *Exarch*, who resided at Ravenna. At length Astulphus, king of Lombardy, taking advantage of the popular commotions, reduced that province, together with the Pentapolis, under his dominion (753).

Pope Stephen III, dreading the increased power of the Lombard kings, had recourse to Pepin, king of France, for assistance: who compelled Astulphus to surrender his new conquests to the see of Rome (756); and thus laid the foundation of the temporal power of the popes. During the residence of the popes at Avignon (1309 to 1377), the cities of Romagna threw off their allegiance to the holy see; and either assumed independence or put themselves under the protection of their more powerful neighbours: in which state they probably remained till they were again united to the possessions of the church (1530). Ferrara was restored in 1597.

From this period, Romagna underwent the revolutions of the Ecclesiastical States till the late conquests of Bonaparte in Italy; when the pope was obliged, by the treaty of Tolentino (1797), to cede Romagna, Bologna, and Ferrara, to the French; and it was annexed to the Cisalpine republic, afterwards the new kingdom of Italy. On the deposition however of Bonaparte, these territories were by the congress of Vienna (1815) restored to the Pope.

LATIUM OR ROME.

Rome, destined to be the mistress of the world, was founded by Romulus, one of the descendants of Æneas (B.C. 753).

During the reigns of the kings, Italy was divided into small independent states; and the imperial city could boast of the sovereignty of the small district of Latium only: but, in course of time, the whole peninsula was annexed, in succession, to the Roman territories by alliance or by conquest.

The regal power, which became odious in the person of Tarquin II, was abrogated on his expulsion: and a *republican* form of government established in its stead (509). Their first foreign conquest was the capture of Veii by Camillus, when the Veian territories were annexed to the Roman empire (396). In the south of Italy, they reduced the Campani (339): and after a war of fifty years duration, the Samnites were eventually subjected by the Romans (290). About the same period Umbria was also subdued. The Tarentine war next employed the Roman arms: and by the speedy submission of all the southern nations of Italy (272), together with the conquest of Picenum, Salentum, and other petty states (266), Rome became mistress of all the countries in Italy from the remotest part of Etruria to the Ionian sea. The Carthaginians next excited her jealousy: which led to the first Punic war (264). This was soon followed by a rupture with the queen of Illyricum; and which terminated in the conquest of all her dominions (228). The reduction of the Cisalpine Gauls by Marcellus (222) rendered the Romans masters of all Italy to the very foot of the Alps, including the peninsula of Istria, and the opposite coast of Dalmatia. The progress of the Carthaginian arms in Spain revived the jealousy between the rival republics. The siege of Saguntum was the signal for hostilities, and the second Punic war commenced (218), which brought both countries to the brink of ruin. During this contest the Romans made themselves masters of all the country in Spain between the Pyrenees and the Iberus (217). The celebrated Publius Cornelius Scipio (afterwards called Africanus) followed up these victories by the conquest of nearly the whole country (205).

The ambition of Rome now exceeded all limits, and aspired

to the conquest of the world. She was undone by victory: and pretexts the most frivolous were assigned as the cause of hostilities. Such was the origin of the third Punic war (150). During the course of it, the Romans landed an immense army in Africa; utterly destroyed the city of Carthage; and conquered the whole country (146). The same year is equally memorable for the destruction of Corinth, and the reduction of all the Grecian states. The arms of the republic were also successful in Spain: and by the taking of Numantia by Publius Æmilianus Scipio (133) Spain might be considered as completely subdued. Soon after this period, we find the Romans engaged in a contest respecting the kingdom of Pergamus; which eventually submitted to their arms (129). The Numidian war, which broke out soon after, afforded many instances of the injustice, venality, and insolence of the republic. Their arms however were crowned with success; and Jugurtha was led in chains to adorn the triumph of the victor (105).

The subsequent conquest of Gaul (56) and invasion of Britain by Julius Cæsar form an interesting portion of the history of this period. By his abilities and good fortune Cæsar became master of the empire (48). No vestige of the republic now remained: the senate was dispossessed of all its power; and the foundation was laid for a perpetual monarchy, which was usurped by Octavius, afterwards surnamed Augustus (31). Augustus however did not take on himself the imperial title; yet his power was equal to that of the most absolute sovereign. He new-modelled the state, flattered the people, and rendered monarchy supportable to republicans. His long and peaceful reign, his uniform government, and his attention to the true interests of the country, tended to establish his authority, and secure the permanency of the empire. It was during this happy and pacific period that our Saviour, JESUS CHRIST, was born.

After a long reign of fifty-seven years, Augustus was succeeded by a race of emperors whose lives, characters, and transactions

are well known to every reader of history. The government framed by Augustus, being founded on the power of the sword and not on the consent of the people, degenerated in proportion as the army became corrupted. The chief acquisitions to the empire had been made during the time of the republic: under Augustus, however, several of the German tribes felt the power of the Roman arms, and submitted to his dominion. That prudent prince had resolved to confine the boundaries of the empire to the limits which nature seemed to have pointed out: viz. the Atlantic ocean on the west, the Rhine and Danube on the north, the Euphrates and the Phasis on the east, and the sandy deserts of Arabia and Africa on the south. His immediate successors adopted this resolution: and Britain (or rather, England) was the sole accession to the empire previous to the reign of Trajan. This warlike and virtuous prince extended his dominions by the conquest of Dacia (A. D. 103); and afterwards led his armies against the Persian empire, which he effectually reduced under his dominion (115). He placed over it a tributary king; and contented himself with the districts of Armenia, Assyria, and Mesopotamia, which he had reduced to the state of Roman provinces. On his death (118) the conquered states revolted, and long afterwards proved the scene of continual wars between the Romans and the Persians. Under Trajan the empire arrived at its greatest extent of territory: and from this period it began very sensibly to decline.

Constantine was the first emperor who embraced Christianity: he established it as the religion of the state, and removed the seat of government to Constantinople (330). And on the death of Theodosius (395) the empire was *finally* divided between his two sons Arcadius and Honorius. Honorius was a weak prince; and during his reign the Roman empire fell to decay. The *Visigoths* established a new kingdom in the south of Gaul, and in the mean time the *Alans*, the *Suevi*, and the *Vandals*, marching from the borders of the Rhine, invaded Spain, and established their power in that

country (409). To resist these formidable encroachments, the Roman legions were withdrawn from Britain (410): and towards the latter part of the reign of Honorius not only the Visigoths, but likewise the *Burgundi* and the *Franks* had obtained a permanent seat and authority in the provinces of Gaul. Thus were the dominions of the western empire reduced almost to the narrow limits of Italy. By a fatal policy, the emperors had enlisted amongst their troops a number of mercenaries from the various tribes of those rude nations that inhabited the frontiers; who, at every revolution of the state, gained an increase of pay and privileges. At length their insolence became so great that they insisted on having a third part of the lands in Italy as their portion. Augustulus, the last of the Roman emperors, rejected this audacious demand: but his refusal was favourable to the ambitious views of Odoacer, an enterprising chief of the *Heruli*, then in the service of the emperor. Finding that he was supported by his troops, he seized on the person of Augustulus, and caused himself to be proclaimed *king of Italy* by his fellow soldiers (476). Thereby extinguishing the very name of Roman emperor; and sealing the destruction of the western empire.

The reign of Odoacer was not long: he was deprived of his crown by Theodoric, the celebrated chief of the *Ostrogoths*, who was in his turn proclaimed sovereign of Italy (493). Theodoric fixed his residence at Ravenna, which in real magnificence vied with Rome. On the death of Amalasontha (534), the Greek emperor Justinian resolved on the recovery of Italy: which after a war of many years was at length finally reduced by Narses (553); and thus became annexed to the eastern or Greek empire.

The *Lombards* having established themselves in the north of Italy (570), soon extended their arms towards the south, and reduced several places in that part of the country (572): so that the imperial dominions in Italy were now confined to Romagna, Pentapolis, the dukedom of Rome, and a few other places.

Things remained in this situation till the publication of the celebrated edict against the worship of images, by the emperor Leo III, surnamed Isauricus (726); when the citizens of Rome drove out the duke, and renounced their allegiance to the empire, rather than submit to that odious decree. The *popes* (or bishops) had hitherto held the chief authority in the *city*; and though they acknowledged the sovereignty of the emperors, they soon aspired at independence and universal dominion. The present opportunity was favourable to their views: the Roman senate was revived (730), but the pontiffs assumed the chief direction of public affairs, and animated their councils. The conquests of Pepin, king of France, confirmed their authority. That prince yielded to Stephen, and his successors on the papal throne, his newly acquired dominion of the Exarchate, and Pentapolis (756); which donation has usually been considered as the commencement of the *temporal power of the Popes*.

The power and authority of the holy see soon began to increase; and eventually extended its spiritual jurisdiction over all the Christian kingdoms. Owing to the violent commotions which existed in Rome about the beginning of the fourteenth century pope Clement V removed the holy see to Avignon in France (1309), which for sixty-eight years became the residence of the reigning pontiffs. During this period the cities of Romagna and Ferrara withdrew their allegiance from the pope. The former however was restored in 1530, and the latter in 1597: and the papal territories were soon afterwards further enlarged by the grant of the duchy of Urbino (1631).

These several states remained in possession of the reigning pontiffs till Bonaparte compelled them to cede the districts of Romagna, Bologna, and Ferrara (1797): which he annexed to the Cisalpine republic. This step however did not satisfy that ambitious monarch, for he afterwards published a decree (May 17, 1809) whereby the Ecclesiastical States were

declared to be united to the French empire; and whereby the city of Rome was declared a *free* and imperial city. Thus it was for some time supposed that the temporal dominion of the pope had terminated: but, on the deposition of Bonaparte, he was by the congress of Vienna (1815) reinstated in nearly all his former possessions.

NAPLES.

The ancient inhabitants of this country were constantly engaged in war with the Romans, and were at length obliged to yield to the superior valour of those haughty and imperious republicans. The Campanians were the first to submit to the Romans (B. C. 339); and next the Samnites (290). The subsequent conquest of Tarentum (272) led to the reduction of the whole of this part of Italy. Annexed to the Roman empire it underwent all the revolutions of that state, till it was recovered by the celebrated Narses (A. D. 553): when it became subject to the Constantinopolitan or Greek empire; but the Lombards having afterwards invaded this country (572), greatly extended their dominions; and in 668 the whole of the present Terra d'Otranto was taken from the eastern emperor.

This country was then subject to the kings of Lombardy, till that monarchy was overturned by Charlemagne (774), when it probably remained subject to the French during the existence of the family of Charlemagne. About the middle of the ninth century we read of the principalities of Beneventum, and Salerno, and of the dukedom of Capua, as independent states. The Saracens also, from the western parts of Africa, made themselves masters of several places (840). The dukedom of Capua was afterwards annexed to the principality of Salerno (1038).

The year 1016 is fixed as the date of the first arrival of the Normans in this country. In 1029 they built the city of Aversa, and erected the territory around it into a county, or earldom: from which period we may date their settlement in this state. They afterwards reduced the greatest part of Apulia and Calabria (1043). Robert Guiscard completed the conquest: and with the assistance of his brother Roger, he also took possession of Sicily (1072). The same success attended their arms against Salerno and the neighbouring states (1077): which completed the conquest of this country. Roger II, count of Sicily, having succeeded to all these dominions, assumed the title of king of Sicily, prince of Capua, and duke of Apulia and Calabria.

His descendants enjoyed the succession till the reign of William III; when the emperor Henry VI seized it, in right of his wife Constantia (1194): and it remained in the hands of the Germans till pope Urban IV invited Charles, duke of Anjou, into Italy; who, having beheaded Conradin the lawful heir, was crowned king of Naples and Sicily (1266). The House of Anjou kept possession of the throne about one hundred and seventy years: at the end of which period Alphonso, king of Arragon and Sicily, received the crown of Naples from the hands of the pope (1442). His grandson Frederic III was obliged to resign his crown; and Ferdinand king of Spain seized on his dominions (1503). It was then governed by viceroys till the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the Imperialists made themselves masters of Naples (1708), and at the peace of Utrecht obliged the Spaniards to cede this kingdom to the house of Austria, and the island of Sicily to the duke of Savoy.

The kingdom of Naples remained in possession of the Austrians till the year 1735, when Don Carlos, son of the king of Spain, was proclaimed king of the two Sicilies: in whose family it continued till Bonaparte sent a numerous force against the Neapolitan dominions, under the command of his brother Joseph; who drove Ferdinand from the throne of Naples, and

was himself proclaimed king of the Two Sicilies in his stead (March 30, 1806). This new monarch however being afterwards called to the throne of Spain, the French emperor bestowed the kingdom of Naples on his brother-in-law Murat: but on the deposition of Bonaparte, this country was by the congress of Vienna (1815) restored to Ferdinand; and Murat was shot, in the course of the same year, for attempting to regain the throne.

SICILY.

This great and fruitful island was at first known by the names of Sicania, Sicilia, Trinacria, and Triquetra. About three hundred years after the arrival of the Siculi, the Greeks visited this island; and Archaias, one of the Heracleidæ, laid the foundation of Syracuse (B.C. 732). Other cities afterwards sprang up; which in time rose to great eminence, and preserved themselves independent of each other. But, of all these, *Syracuse* was the most powerful and renowned; and gave laws to the whole island. The Carthaginians afterwards interfered with them, and obliged them to cede many of their possessions (404). The Romans however, during the first Punic war, conquered all the Carthaginian territories in Sicily (242); and soon afterwards reduced the whole island (210).

It remained in their possession till the extinction of the western empire: when it underwent the fate of Italy, till it was recovered by Narses (A.D. 553); and annexed to the Eastern empire. The Saracens, from the western parts of Africa, taking advantage of some domestic dissentions, reduced the whole island (827); excepting the city of Syracuse, which held out till the year 878: and it remained in their possession above two centuries. Robert Guiscard, the Norman duke of Apulia and Calabria, invaded Sicily (1060): and after a contest of near twelve years the Saracens were driven

out (1072). This island therefore underwent all the revolutions of the kingdom of Naples, till the accession of Charles duke of Anjou (1266).

The severity of this prince and the licentiousness of his soldiers rendered him odious to the nation: an accidental affray produced a general massacre of the French troops*, and lost him the sovereignty of the island (1282). Peter III king of Arragon supported the rebels, and openly claimed the throne in right of his wife; which, after an ineffectual resistance, was at length acceded to by Charles. On the death of John (1479) this island devolved to Ferdinand king of Spain: who, soon after, reduced Naples (1503): and it being again united to Naples, underwent all the revolutions of that kingdom till the death of Charles II king of Spain; when a furious war was lighted up to settle the succession to that monarchy: at the close of which, it was stipulated by the treaty of Utrecht (1713) that this island should be given to Victor Amadeus duke of Savoy. But, by the quadruple alliance (1718), it was agreed that Victor should cede Sicily to the emperor of Germany in exchange for the island of Sardinia: which was at length ratified by the court of Spain (1720).

The Austrians kept possession of the Two Sicilies till they were driven out by Don Carlos (1735); and in his family it still remains, together with the kingdom of Naples (1815), of which they had been nine years deprived by the conquests of the French in Italy.

SPAIN.

The Celtes, or Gauls, are said to have come first into this country about the middle of the seventeenth century before the Christian æra. The Carthaginians had settled themselves

* This massacre is known in history by the name of the *Sicilian Vespers*.

here about the sixth century before Christ: but it does not appear that they had reduced any great part of the country till after the first Punic war; when Hamilcar, and his son Asdrubal, subdued nearly all that part of Spain which extends from the Iberus to the Western ocean. Hannibal subdued the territory lying between the Iberus and the Pyrenees, and thus provoked the second Punic war (B.C. 218). The Romans however, under the two Scipios, wrested this last-mentioned conquest from the hands of the Carthaginians: and, in the course of a few years, drove them entirely out of Spain (205). After the destruction of Carthage (146), the Romans attempted the reduction of the whole of this country: and by the capture of Numantia (133) the major part of the country may be considered as subdued. When Julius Cæsar was prætor in Spain (67), he reduced several nations that had never before been subject to Rome.

It afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the Roman empire till the reign of Honorius; when the Vandals, Alans, and Suevi, taking advantage of the weakness of that prince, entered Spain (A. D. 409), and very soon conquered all the western parts of it, which they afterwards divided by lot between them. But the Suevi alone, of all the tribes who entered Spain, may be considered as having founded and preserved the sole monarchy there. The conquest of Lusitania, and afterwards of Bætica and Carthagena (441), greatly enlarged their kingdom: but their subsequent disputes with the Visigoths, in the south of Gaul, brought on them the enmity of Euric; who having entered this country (456) reduced the greatest part of Spain under his dominion, and confined the Suevi to the mountains of Galicia (477). This small remnant of the Suevian monarchy was finally reduced by Leovigild, king of the Visigoths, in 584.

During the reign of Rodrigo, their last king, the two sons of the deposed monarch, Witiza, invited the Saracens from the opposite coast of Africa to their assistance. Musa, the

Mahommedan commander in that province, sent over a powerful army; and, by the battle of Xeres, soon put an end to the Gothic empire (712). The history of Spain, during the dominion of the Saracens, is involved in much obscurity. We are informed in general that it was governed by viceroys of the Caliphs for nearly half a century. But, when the dynasty of the Abassidæ ascended the throne of Damascus (750), Abdurrahman, who escaped the massacre of the Ommiades, fled to Spain, threw off the yoke of the Caliphs, and rendered himself independent in this country (755). He fixed his residence at Cordova; which he made the seat of arts, magnificence, and pleasure. He styled himself *Caliph of Cordova*, and his dynasty kept possession of the throne near three hundred years. But the Moorish princes became, by degrees, weak and effeminate; and their ministers insolent and proud: which at last overturned the kingdom of Cordova. On the death of Mutamed, the last of the dynasty of the Ommiades (1038), the country, possessed by the Moors *, became one scene of confusion. Every governor of a province or a town seized as large a share of the general spoil as he was able, and erected it into an independent state: whence there arose almost as many kingdoms as cities. Cordova, Toledo, Seville, Lisbon, Tortosa, Valentia, Murcia, Almeira, &c. had each their particular sovereigns: which were eventually and successively conquered by the Christian kings, who had in the mean time been establishing themselves on the ruins of the Moorish affairs †; and of whose history it will be proper to give a detached account.

* The Mahommedan conquerors of Spain are sometimes called *Moors*, from their having come from Mauritania.

† Those who escaped the immediate attack of the Christians were afterwards obliged to submit to new masters, of their own faith, who invaded their country from the opposite coast of Africa. These were the Moravids *(Al Moravids)*, and the Moheds *(Al Moheds)*. The former came over first as allies, and afterwards as conquerors (1091): and Spain may be considered in some measure as dependent on their power. But on the destruction of their dynasty in Africa, they were succeeded by the

When the Saracens first invaded Spain, many of the cities embraced the religion and manners of the conquerors: but Pelagius, firm to his faith and his duty, retired to the mountains of Asturias and Biscay, and there founded a Christian kingdom (718); which he defended by his valour, and transmitted to his posterity. Alphonso I greatly extended its limits by the conquest of Leon, Galicia, and Castile (747). His son and successor Froila built Oviedo (761), where he established his court; and whence he and his successors assumed the title of *kings of Oviedo*: but, when Ordonno II removed the court to Leon, they were styled *kings of Leon* (914). About the year 927, the counts of *Castile* rendered themselves independent of Leon: but that province, being united to Navarre (1028), was afterwards erected into a kingdom in favour of Ferdinand, the second son of Sancho, surnamed *the great*, king of Navarre and Arragon (1033); who, having reduced Veremond III the last king of Leon, thereby united the two kingdoms of *Castile and Leon* (1037). His son took Toledo from the Moors, and thereby annexed the greatest part of *New* Castile to his dominions (1085). By the marriage of Urraca with Alphonso I king of Arragon, this country became united to that of Arragon (1109); which continued till the time of her death (1127). On the decease of Alphonso VIII (1157), his two sons divided the kingdom between them; Sancho took Castile, and Ferdinand had Leon and Galicia: but in 1230 they were inseparably united. Ferdinand III took the celebrated city of Cordova from the Moors (1236); and, soon after, made himself master of Seville (1248). Alphonso XI reduced the province of Andalusia (1344). Isabella, who had married Ferdinand, son of John II king of Arragon (1469), succeeded to Castile and Leon on the death of her brother (1474).

latter in 1146. One of the descendants of this race met with a signal defeat on the plains of Tolosa (1212), which ruined their affairs in Spain; and revived, among the Mahommedan states, the jarring interests of petty and of rival kings.

It has been already observed that Pepin drove the Saracens out of France (759): and that Charlemagne conquered the country as far as the Ebro (778); which was at first governed by officers appointed by his successors. But these governors afterwards renounced their allegiance, and assumed the title of independent sovereigns. Garcias Ximenes was elected king of *Navarre* in 857: he is said to have married Urraca of Arragon, whereby these two provinces became united. We know but little of their history till the reign of Sancho the great; on whose death (1035) his son Garcias succeeded in Navarre, and Ramiro in Arragon. On the decease of Sancho IV (1076), this kingdom was seized by Sancho-Ramiro king of Arragon: and remained united thereto till the death of Alphonso I (1134); when the two states, not being able to agree in the choice of the same sovereign, again became separated and chose different kings. Joanna, queen of Navarre, married Philip, surnamed *the fair*, who in the following year (1285) succeeded to the throne of France. These two kingdoms therefore remained united till the extinction of the Capetingian dynasty, on the death of Charles IV (1328): when it descended to Joanna, the daughter of Louis X king of France, who had married Philip d'Evreux. It continued in that family till, by the marriage of Blanca with John of Arragon (1419), these two kingdoms again became united (1458). On the decease of John II (1479) his son Ferdinand succeeded him in Arragon and Sicily; and his daughter Eleonora was declared queen of Navarre, who immediately raised her grandson Francis Phœbus to the throne. During the reign of his sister Catherine, Ferdinand king of Castile, Leon, and Arragon, seized upon the kingdom of Navarre (1512), and thereby united the whole of Spain under one crown.

Arragon was erected into a separate and independent kingdom by Sancho the great, king of Navarre, in favour of his son Ramiro (1035); whose son and successor, Sancho-Ramiro, seized upon Navarre on the death of Sancho IV (1076); and afterwards became king of Castile and Leon, in right of his

wife Urraca (1109): but Castile and Leon were separated from it on the death of his wife (1127); and Navarre also on his own death (1134). John II (king of Navarre in right of his wife) succeeded to this kingdom, in his own right, in 1458. His son Ferdinand, surnamed *the Catholic*, by his marriage with Isabella, became king of Castile (1474), and afterwards succeeded to the throne of Arragon and Sicily on the death of his father (1479). The issue of this marriage was the celebrated Charles V.

The reign of *Ferdinand and Isabella* is an eventful period in the history of Spain. They attempted the expulsion of the Moors (1483), which was accomplished in about nine years by dispossessing them of Granada (1492), the only place then held by them in this country. Ferdinand being in possession of Sicily by succession, afterwards seized upon Naples (1503) and united it to his crown. The subsequent conquest of Navarre (1512) rendered him the first monarch of *all* Spain. His descendants kept possession of the throne till the late singular abdication of Charles IV in favour of Bonaparte (1808); who immediately conferred the crown on his brother Joseph, in exchange for that of Naples. The victorious career however of the duke of Wellington obliged the French to evacuate this country (1813); and restored the weak and bigoted Ferdinand to the throne of his ancestors.

PORTUGAL.

This kingdom forms the greatest part of what was anciently called Lusitania: and its early history is the same as that of Spain; it having been successively in subjection to the Romans, Suevi, Visigoths, and Moors. In the contests between the latter power and the Christian princes in Spain, Henry surnamed *the great*, grandson of Robert king of France, signalized himself; and was rewarded by Alphonso VI king of Castile and Leon with that division of Portugal then in the

hands of the Christians, to be held with the title of *count* (A.D. 1094).

Henry was succeeded by his son Alphonso, who threw off the Castilian yoke (1126); and who, having soon after gained a decisive victory over five Moorish sovereigns (1139), was then proclaimed *king* by his soldiers. Alphonso extended his dominions by the conquest of Lisbon and Evora (1147): and his son Sancho I enlarged the kingdom to its present extent by the reduction of the province of Algarva (1190). Nothing memorable has been recorded of their immediate successors. On the death of cardinal Henry, the kingdom was seized by Philip II king of Spain, one of the competitors for the throne, in right of his first wife Mary (1580).

The cruel policy of this monarch, and of his immediate successors, disgusted his new subjects; till, at length, irritated by repeated injuries and insults, they rebelled, and raised to the throne John *duke of Braganza*, the presumptive heir (1640); in whose family it still remains. During the late war with France a numerous army under the command of Junot invaded Portugal, and reduced the whole country (1807): but the royal family, rather than submit themselves to the power of their conqueror, retired with the court to the Brazils. The French were driven out in the following year by the English: but the royal family still hold their court in their transatlantic possessions; and have not, as yet, thought proper to return to their European dominions.

DALMATIA.

This country formed great part of the ancient Illyricum, the precise boundaries of which cannot now be ascertained. It was formerly inhabited by a daring and adventurous race of freebooters, who were said to have been reduced by Philip king of Macedon. But, if so, we find them soon afterwards independent again: for, Ceuta queen of the Illyrians having

assassinated a Roman ambassador, the consuls Fulvius and Posthumius obliged her to cede all her dominions to the republic, except a few small places (B.C. 228). Under the Roman and the Eastern empire it continued till about the middle of the fifth century of the Christian æra, when it was probably possessed by the Ostrogoths: but, soon after the extinction of their empire in Italy, it was seized by the Avars or Huns (A.D. 566).

It remained in their possession till it was seized by Charlemagne (794). We afterwards find the Onigars in possession of this country (886); who were in their turn driven out by the Venetians (997). In the beginning of the twelfth century it was seized by Coloman king of Hungary (1103): an event which was the origin of several furious contests between the two nations. For upwards of two centuries it was the cause and scene of bloodshed, and mutual conquests, between the Venetians, Hungarians, and Turks: and although the Venetians reduced it again about the middle of the twelfth century, yet it was not till after the fifteenth century that they could be said to have had complete possession of Dalmatia. It has since undergone the revolutions of the republic of Venice; and is now in the possession of the Austrians.

BULGARIA AND SERVIA.

This country, which stretches along the southern banks of the Danube, was anciently called Mœsia, which submitted to the Roman arms during the reign of Augustus. It was afterwards divided into Mœsia Superior and Inferior: which nearly correspond with the present provinces of Servia and Bulgaria. About the middle of the fifth century of the Christian æra, the emperor Marcian suffered the Ostrogoths to settle in Mœsia Superior: and the Bulgarians migrating from the banks of the Volga, eventually took possession of Mœsia Inferior, about the middle of the seventh century.

They soon after established a kingdom (A.D. 687), which in process of time extended from the Euxine to the Adriatic, and became a terror to the emperors of the east. At length, the emperor Basil reduced Bulgaria to the form of a province (1019). They revolted in 1186; but their subsequent history scarcely merits attention. The sultan Amurath invaded this country; the subjugation of which was completed by Bajazet his successor (1396). But little is known of the present state of these provinces: and its dependence on the Porte, during these rebellious times, is merely nominal.

EPIRUS.

This country (now called Albania) was anciently governed by its own princes; in which state it made some considerable figure. Its history commences with the reign of Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles, who distinguished himself at the siege of Troy. Epirus (like the other Grecian states) was probably brought under the dominion of Philip king of Macedon (B.C. 338): but, if so, it soon recovered its independence. The most remarkable period in the history of Epirus, is the reign of Pyrrhus II: but, soon after his death the Epirots formed themselves into a *republic* (240). Under this new form of government Epirus never made any considerable figure as an independent nation; and in the following century it was permanently united to the Roman empire (146).

It afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the Roman and Eastern empire till the taking of Constantinople by the Latins (A.D. 1204); when Michael Angelus, a prince nearly related to the Greek emperor, seized on Ætolia and Epirus, of which he assumed the title of *despot* or prince. On the extinction of this family the sultan Amurath II seized the favourable opportunity of reducing the country (1432). Whilst this monarch was engaged in the Hungarian wars, the celebrated George Castriot, commonly known by the name of

Scanderbeg, who had been brought up in the Mohammedan religion, revolted (1447); and maintained himself against the whole power of the Turks. On his death (1466), the Turks, who were at that time ravaging the country, completely reduced it, and annexed it to their empire. It has remained in their possession ever since.

ÆTOLIA.

The inhabitants of this country are represented as a turbulent and unprincipled race of men; but at the same time jealous defenders of their liberties. Their early history is uninteresting, and little known: and though they were at first independent, like the other states of Greece, yet after the battle of Chæronea (B.C. 338) they might be considered in some measure as under the influence of Macedon. On the death of Alexander the Great, however, they took advantage of the quarrels among his successors to shake off the yoke. At the time of the Achæan league, the Ætolian republic (which was formed upon the same plan) might be ranked the next in power among the states of Greece; and was adopted as such with a view of forming a counter alliance.

When the Romans interfered with the affairs of Greece, this country also felt the weight of their arms: and, on the destruction of Corinth, Ætolia, with the other states of Greece, was reduced to a Roman province (146). In this condition, with little alteration, Ætolia continued till the taking of Constantinople by the Latins (A.D. 1204); when Michael Angelus, a noble Grecian of the imperial family, seized on Ætolia and Epirus. And, from this period, it underwent all the revolutions of that kingdom, as related in the preceding article.

THRACE.

This country was anciently divided into numberless petty kingdoms, all independent of each other; but whose history would afford neither amusement nor instruction. Great part of the country was conquered by Philip king of Macedon (B.C. 354). On the division of the dominions of his son Alexander the Great, which followed the battle of Ipsus (301), this country, together with Asia Minor, was allotted to Lysimachus. This monarch was slain by Seleucus Nicanor, who seized on his dominions: but the rebellious provinces soon renounced his authority, and Thrace was shortly after reduced by the Macedonians.

After the reduction of Macedon by the Romans (146), these provinces also fell under their dominion; and followed the revolutions of their empire, till Constantine removed the seat of empire to Byzantium, an ancient city in this country, which thenceforward took the name of *Constantinople*, and became the metropolis of the world (A.D. 330). The weak and imprudent administration of its sovereigns, however, reduced the eastern empire to a very low ebb: but it was revived by the wise and vigorous conduct of Justin and Justinian. During the reign of the former, the celebrated Belisarius greatly distinguished himself in the Persian war. He afterwards drove the Vandals out of Africa and their dependent islands of Sardinia, &c. (534). He likewise seized upon Italy and Sicily: and, by his prudence and valour, Narses was enabled finally to expel the Goths from the Italian states (553); thereby, once more uniting the two imperial cities.

On the death of Justinian the empire tended fast to dissolution. Italy was conquered by the Lombards (570): and, in the beginning of the following century, Chosroes king of Persia invaded (603) and subdued many of the eastern pro-

vinces. Heraclius however, after an interval of unaccountable indifference, at length took the field and recovered all those conquests (627). Soon after this, the Saracens dismembered the empire of some of its finest provinces. These new enemies first attacked the Romans in Syria (632); and, having reduced the whole of that district (639), they pursued their conquests with incredible rapidity along the northern coast of Africa (640), and afterwards reduced Rhodes (642) and Cyprus (648). During this period, the capital was the constant theatre of rebellions and conspiracies: and for the space of two hundred years the imperial family itself presented scenes of the most atrocious vices and horrid crimes.

The reign of Leo III, surnamed *Isauricus*, was disgraced by a violent contest respecting the worship of images. The edict of that emperor, to destroy these objects of adoration and to suppress the practice (726), was violently opposed by the See of Rome, and eventually led to its separation from the empire. The perpetual inroads and ravages of the Bulgarians about this period gave constant employment to the imperial forces, till they were at length reduced by the emperor Basil .II (1019). This contest was scarcely ended, when the imperial dominions in Asia Minor were invaded (1074) by the Seljukian Turks, who there founded the monarchy of Iconium: and, for many years, that country became the seat of constant warfare between the Seljuks and the Greeks.

When the Crusaders passed through Constantinople, on their way to Palestine, Baldwin (count of Flanders) who commanded them, under pretence of revenging the death of Alexius, made himself master of Constantinople, and was soon after crowned emperor (1204). The greatest part of the imperial dominions were divided among the different leaders of the invading army*. During these troubles Theodore Las-

* The greatest part of *the coast* of the Adriatic, of the Morea, and of Greece was adjudged to the republic of Venice. Boniface, marquis

caris, son-in-law to Alexius III, fled to Asia Minor and established the empire of Nice. Michael Palæologus (who had usurped this new sovereignty) dispossessed the Latins and removed the seat of his government to Constantinople (1261).

During the reign of his successors the Turks rendered themselves formidable, and by the capture of Gallipolis (1358) obtained a footing in this country. The sultan Amurath I conquered almost the whole of Thrace, and made Adrianople the seat of his government in Europe (1360). His son Bajazet extended these conquests by the reduction of almost the whole of the imperial dominions (1390), together with Walachia, Moldavia, and Bulgaria (1396): so that nothing was now left to the Greek emperor but the city of Constantinople and its surrounding country. This capital was oftentimes besieged by the Turkish forces, and was at length carried by storm, by Mohammed II, and given up for three days to the pillage and brutality of an enraged soldiery (1453). From this period Constantinople has continued to be the seat of the Ottoman or Turkish empire.

During the reign of Selim I, the inhabitants of Mesopotamia threw off the Persian yoke (1514) and put themselves under the protection of the Turks. This event facilitated the conquest of Syria and Egypt (1517), which had been long meditated by the Ottoman emperors. The reign of Soliman II is one of the most illustrious of all the successors of Othmân. He reduced the island of Rhodes (1522); seized upon Bagdad (1534); and also added Georgia to his possessions. The war in Hungary was renewed (1541); by which that kingdom was almost wholly reduced under his power. He also recovered

of Montferrat, received, as his share, the Isle of Candia (which he afterwards sold to the Venetians) together with Thessaly and the remnant of the Greek empire in Asia, which had escaped the ravages of the Seljukian Turks. Other chiefs were likewise rewarded with smaller estates, which they held of Baldwin, as vassals of the empire.

Tunis from the Spaniards (1541). But, soon after this, the Ottoman power began to decline. The Persians wrested from them Shirwan and Bagdad (1604); and extended their dominions to the confines of the Black Sea (1608): but these provinces were recovered in 1638. The Venetians, however, besides possessing themselves of several places in Dalmatia and Albania, had conquered the whole of the Morea (1687). But they were dispossessed again by the Turks in 1715.

By the encroachments, however, of the Russians, the rebellious spirit of the governors or pashaws of the distant provinces, and the insolence of the Janizaries, this country is fast approaching to its dissolution. The recent commotions which have taken place in Constantinople must have brought to the mind of every attentive observer of history, the strong resemblance between the present condition of the government of this country and that of Rome under its degenerate emperors. The conduct of the *Janizaries* is so closely allied to that of the *Prætorian bands*, that we may even fancy ourselves removed into those ancient times, and consider the passing events as a counterpart of those which took place under the Roman emperors during the time of the greatest insolence of that military body.

MACEDON.

This kingdom was founded by Caranus, an Argive, about B.C. 800. Its early history is very uncertain and uninteresting; and does not claim our attention till the invasion of the Persians under Xerxes. This kingdom afterwards gradually increased in power and influence till the reign of Philip, the son of Amyntas (360), under whose auspices it became the umpire of Greece. Philip commenced his ambitious career with success against the Thracians (354). He then got him-

self admitted a member of the Amphictyonic Council, and was soon afterwards elected their chief; which gave him a decided pre-eminence and weight in the affairs of Greece. Philip defeated the combined armies of Athens and Thebes at the battle of Chæronea (338); which decided the fate of Greece, and brought all her states under the dominion of the king of Macedon.

Alexander the Great, the son of Philip, succeeded, at the age of twenty, to the throne of Macedon, and to the command of Greece. In a general assembly at Corinth, he communicated his determination of prosecuting the designs of Philip for the conquest of Persia. On the banks of the Granicus he defeated the army of Darius, and completed the conquest of Asia Minor (334). The subsequent battle of Issus (333) led to the submission of all Syria. He then proceeded to Phœnicia: and after reducing the city of Tyre (332) marched to Jerusalem; where he sacrificed in the holy temple. He next invaded Egypt, and founded the city of Alexandria. Returning from that country he totally defeated Darius again at the battle of Arbela (331), which rendered Alexander master of nearly all his dominions. Having reduced the rebellious provinces of Bactriana, Sogdiana, &c. (329), Alexander turned his arms towards India, and extended his conquest as far as the Hyphasis (328). Alexander died at Babylon on the 21st April, 323; leaving behind him a character which has been variously represented, both by ancient and modern authors *.

On the death of Alexander, violent disputes arose amongst

* The conquests of Alexander have doubtless been attended with the most important consequences in the history of mankind; since they had the effect of diffusing the language, the science, and the arts of the Greeks over a very considerable portion of Asia and Africa: and in this respect they are worthy the attention of every philosophical historian. But, if we view the events of his reign, as those of a *conqueror only*, his name will sink far below that of many ancient and modern

his ambitious generals, for the conquered provinces, and many battles were fought between them for supremacy. At length the battle of Ipsus (301) decided these contests: and from this period, we may date the full sovereignty and independence of the four principal states into which the vast empire of Alexander had been divided; Ptolemy was confirmed in his dominion of *Egypt*, and regained possession of *Cœlo-Syria* and *Palestine:* Seleucus obtained the rest of *Syria*, and was confirmed in his extensive territories between the Euphrates and the Indus: Lysimachus, in addition to his possessions in *Thrace*, acquired *Asia Minor* with the exception of Cilicia: and Cassander was rewarded with the title of king of *Macedon*.

Macedon remained an independent state till the Romans interfered in the affairs of this country. Paulus Æmilius, being sent over with a large army, gained the battle of Pydna (168), and the whole kingdom submitted to the conqueror. Macedon was then divided into four distinct states; each with its separate jurisdiction and its separate capital. But, some pretenders to the throne having afterwards started up, it was thought proper to reduce the whole country to the state of a Roman province (146). It underwent all the revolutions of the Roman and Eastern empire till the encroachments of the Turks in this part of Europe (A.D. 1353): soon after which, it was wholly reduced under their dominion; and has since remained in their possession.

sovereigns; since Alexander overturned only *one* kingdom; and, notwithstanding all his exertions and his martial fame, was defeated in every attempt to extend his arms *beyond* the frontiers of that vanquished country.

BŒOTIA.

THEBES, the principal city in this state, is said to have been founded by Cadmus, a Phœnician, about B. C. 1493 : and the government of it continued for a long time monarchical; but, on the death of Xanthus, the inhabitants established a sort of commonwealth. By the decisive battle of Chæronea (338) they were at length brought under the dominion of Macedon. They probably recovered their independence soon after the final division of the empire of Alexander the Great (301) : and afterwards joined the Achæan league against the Romans; by whom this state was at length reduced to a Roman province (146). It then underwent all the revolutions of that empire, till it was overturned by the Latins (A. D. 1204) : when it was united to Attica, and governed by dukes of its own, till it was taken by the Turks (1456); with whom it now remains.

ATTICA.

THE capital of this country was the celebrated ATHENS, supposed to have been founded by Cecrops and an Egyptian colony B. C. 1582. It was at first governed by *kings*, who were far from being absolute ; but, on the death of Codrus (1070), an end was put to the monarchical form of government, and an elective one substituted in its stead. These new magistrates were denominated *Archons*. Darius, king of Persia, invaded this country; but the immense army of the Persians was defeated with prodigious slaughter on the plains of Marathon (490) by Miltiades ; where the Athenians were covered with glory. Xerxes, the successor of Darius, equipped another immense armament for the same purpose : but the Athenians and Spartans determined to oppose him.

Leonidas king of Sparta, with a chosen band of only three hundred men, bravely, though ineffectually, withstood that incredible force, at the straits of Thermopylæ (480). They were all cut off to a man: a passage was forced into the country; and Athens was pillaged and burnt to the ground. In the following year, however, the Greeks by their perseverance and good fortune totally annihilated the ambitious views of Xerxes.

In 439, a dispute arose between the Corcyrians and Corinthians respecting the sovereignty of Epidamnus; in which the Athenians sided with the former. This contest is worthy of notice, as being not only the origin of those troubles and dissentions which afterwards proved the ruin of the state, but also the point from which Thucydides commences his celebrated history. The attempt of the Thebans to surprise Platæa was the commencement of the Peloponnesian war (May 7, 431). During this contest the Spartans obtained possession of Athens (404), and greatly abridged their power as a state. They soon afterwards recovered their independence (401), which they preserved till Philip king of Macedon interfered with the affairs of Greece.

At this period flourished the celebrated orator Demosthenes, whose animated speeches (mixed however with too much party spirit) made such a wonderful impression on the people of Athens; and are admired, even to this day, by every classical scholar. His eloquence was directed principally against the intrigues and policy of Philip. With the most animated eloquence he roused his own countrymen also to a vigorous effort for the preservation of their natural liberties: but the event was unsuccessful. Philip engaged the combined armies at Chæronea (338): and the victory there gained decided the fate of Greece, and subjected all her states to the dominion of the king of Macedon. Athens continued in subjection to that power, with some slight interruptions, till the battle of Ipsus (301), when it was agreed that it should be restored to its former popular government. It

remained in this free state till Antigonus Gonatus planted another Macedonian garrison here (268): but on the death of his son Demetrius (232), the people, with the assistance of Aratus, regained their liberty, and joined themselves to the Achæan league: and on the dissolution of that confederacy (146) were subjected to the dominion of the Romans.

It underwent the several revolutions of the Roman and Grecian empire till the taking of Constantinople by the Latins (A.D. 1204): when the principality of Athens and Thebes was assigned to Otho de la Roche, a noble warrior of Burgundy, with the title of great duke. It then underwent some other trivial revolutions till the invasion of the Turks, when the sultan Mohammed II strangled the last duke, and thereby reduced the country (1456). It still remains in their hands: and, in the language of an elegant historian, the inhabitants "walk with supine indifference among the glorious ruins of antiquity; and such is the debasement of their character that they are incapable of admiring the genius of their predecessors."

LACONIA OR SPARTA.

THE capital of Laconia was Sparta or Lacedæmon*, and is supposed to have been founded by Lelex about half a century after Cecrops had settled in Attica. In the division of Greece among the Heracleidæ (B.C. 1104), Aristodemus their general became master of Sparta: he was succeeded by his twin-born sons, who were crowned at the same time, and who alternately exercised the supreme power (1102). This bipartite government continued for several centuries; although it proved the source of much civil discord. The most important events in the early history of Sparta are the Messenian wars†: in which the Spartan arms were ultimately successful.

* The inhabitants are indifferently called *Spartans*, or *Lacedæmonians*.

† The first of these arose from a private quarrel, and, after being car-

The two principal states of Greece were Athens and Sparta: who were jealous of each other's power and influence; and ready to seize every opportunity of abridging it. This rivalship was the primary cause of the celebrated Peloponnesian war (431); which, after continuing, with one interruption only, for twenty-seven years, terminated at length in favour of Sparta (404), and by the reduction of Athens raised her to a state of pre-eminence in the affairs of Greece. The Athenians, however, recovered their city (401): and the power of Sparta soon after declined. Together with the rest of Greece it fell under the dominion of Philip king of Macedon (338): but it probably shook off the yoke of Macedon soon after the final division of the empire of Alexander at the battle of Ipsus (301), and was again governed by its double kings. At length Philopœmen, having defeated the Spartans, obliged them to join the Achæan league (191).

This country, including Messenia, then underwent the revolutions of Achaia; and afterwards formed part of the Roman empire till Constantinople was taken by the Latins (A.D. 1204). From this period, to the time of its reduction by the Turks, the history of Sparta is involved in much obscurity: but it probably underwent the principal revolutions of the Morea, as related in the following article.

ried on for nineteen years, was at last finished by the taking of Ithome by the Spartans (724). The Messenians continued in subjection to the Spartans till, irritated by repeated insults, they resolved to throw off the yoke (685): but this contest, like the former, terminated in favour of the Lacedæmonians (671); who divided the country.

At the time of the great earthquake in Sparta, the Messenians took advantage of this dreadful calamity, and joined the Helots in open rebellion (465): but they were at length obliged to submit to the terms of their victorious adversaries (455). They consented to leave their native country, and depart totally from Peloponnesus.

After a long banishment the descendants of these Messenians were restored to their former free state by Epaminondas (369); and were comprehended in the Achæan league about ninety years after this. But from this period the history of Messenia is involved in that of Sparta.

ACHAIA.

This country, which makes so conspicuous a figure in the latter periods of the history of Greece, was not very considerable in earlier times for the number of its troops, for its wealth, or for its extent of territory: but, it was always famed for its probity, its justice, and its love of liberty. Its first annals are not marked by any great action; for, they are not graced by one eminent character. After the death of Alexander the Great, this little republic probably shared the same fate as the rest of Greece.

About the year B.C. 281, the republic of the Achæans recovered its old institutions and unanimity. The inhabitants of Patra, Dymæ, and a few other places set the first example. Sicyon was the first foreign state that joined the confederacy (251); and afterwards Corinth and Megara (243). Many other cities then joined the Achæans: and this alliance was afterwards denominated the *Achæan league*. All the cities subject thereto were governed by a general assembly of the whole, formed by deputies chosen out of each state; and at which meeting every public measure was discussed. This republic had now become very formidable to the surrounding nations: but it could not withstand the power of the Romans; who, having reduced the city of Corinth (146), at that time the chief city of the confederacy, reduced the whole of Greece into the form of a Roman province. This country then underwent nearly all the revolutions of the Roman and Eastern empire till Constantinople was taken by the Latins (A.D. (1204); when the maritime cities of Peloponnesus, with most of the islands, were given to the Venetians.

Its subsequent history is dark and uncertain: but it is probable that on the restoration of the Greek empire in Constantinople it was governed by some of the imperial family, who assumed the title of Despots of the Morea. For, we learn

that on the accession of Constantine (one of these despots) to the imperial throne (1448), he divided the Morea between his brothers Demetrius and Thomas. But, these princes making war on each other, Mohammed II, under pretence of assisting one against the other, stripped them both of their dominions (1460)*. The Turks were driven out of the Morea by the Venetians under Morosini (1687); but they retook it in the next war (1715): and it now continues in their hands.

CRETE OR CANDIA.

THIS island was anciently inhabited by the Idæi Dactyli, and Curetes. In B.C. 1015, Minos reigned here. The government of the Cretans was at first monarchical: but it was at length changed into a republic. The Romans, who never wanted a pretext for their encroachments, reduced it in the year 66. From that æra to the present time, the Cretans have no longer formed a separate nation, nor made any figure among the states of the world. The island remained subject to the Roman and Eastern empire till it was seized by a piratical band of Saracens from Andalusia (A.D. 823); by whom it was held near one hundred and thirty-eight years: but this band of corsairs was expelled by the emperor Nicephorus II (960).

When Constantinople was taken by the Latins (1204), this island was given to the marquis of Montferrat: but he, more covetous of gold than glory, sold it to the Venetians; under whom it assumed the name of *Candia*. It remained in their possession near four centuries and a half; when, in the midst of a profound peace, the sultan Ibrahim suddenly appeared before it with an immense force (1645). The greatest part of the island was immediately subdued: but the siege of the capital was protracted for twenty-five years; when, after more

* The Venetians still held some of the maritime cities, till they were dispossessed of them by the Turks in 1540.

than 200,000 lives had been lost in the contest, Candia was entirely reduced under the dominion of the Turks (1669), in whose possession it now remains.

KOREA.

This country was formerly divided into several independent monarchies; one of which (called Tsaosien) was founded by Ki-tsu about the year B.C. 1122: whose successors reigned upwards of a thousand years. Another of these sovereignties was called Korea, which gave its name to the whole province, and which was founded about the year 223. After existing about nine hundred years it was reduced by the Chinese (A.D. 677); but in the beginning of the tenth century it became again independent (904). A relation of the various contests for power and supremacy, which took place in this remote corner of the world, cannot be very interesting to an European. It will therefore be sufficient to observe that, in the year 1664, the Koreans put themselves under the protection of the Chinese; to whom they are now tributary.

LYAU-TONG.

The Ki-tans were a people of eastern Tatary, who dwelt to the north and north-east of the province of Pe-che-li in China; particularly in Lyau-tong. In process of time they subdued all the countries between Korea and Câshgar; besides several northern provinces of China, as will appear in the sequel. The Ki-tan empire began in Lyau-tong; and is reckoned to commence from the year A.D. 907: it continued two hundred and eighteen years, under nine princes, and gave more trouble to China than all the other inhabitants of Tatary. It was at length conquered by the Nyu-tche, or eastern Tatars,

who at this time had assumed the name of Kin (1125), and remained in their possession till it was reduced by the Moguls (1234): after which it underwent all the revolutions of their empire in China.

MANTCHEW OR EASTERN TATARY.

This country was formerly inhabited by a race of men called Nyu-tche, or Eastern Tatars, who appear to have been established here ever since the year A. D. 907, and who were probably subject to or dependent on the empire of Lyau. But Aguta revolted from them (1114); and, assuming the title of emperor himself, gave the name of Kin to his new possessions. He afterwards succeeded in putting an end to the empire of Lyau (1125). Towards the middle of the century, this new empire had greatly encroached on the Chinese dominions: for, in 1141, the emperor not only gave up all the northern parts of his dominions, but agreed to render tribute for the southern parts which were left in his possession. The Kin empire however was, in its turn, obliged to submit to the dominion of the Moguls (1234), and this country underwent the revolutions of that empire till the year 1616; when the Mantchew Tatars threw off the Chinese yoke, and rendered themselves independent. They next carried their arms into the heart of China: and their general, Xun-tchi, was soon afterwards raised to the imperial dignity (1644). This country thus became once more united to China: and the Mantchew Tatars now rule over the whole of the Chinese dominions.

CHINA.

The original form of government in this country was monarchical. In this opinion the Chinese historians agree: and they produce a series of kings or emperors from Fo-hi to the

present time. The history of China, during the reign of Fo-hi and his immediate successors, is fabulous; and the chronology of that period altogether uncertain. The country was divided into a number of districts or provinces, governed by princes who were absolute within their own territories, but who acknowledged the sovereignty of one who was styled the Emperor; and who, in process of time, became absolute.

The most brilliant period in the ancient history of this country is the time of CONFUCIUS. This great man was born B.C. 552, and died in the seventy-third year of his age (479). He was the prince of Chinese philosophers; and the best, as well as the wisest man, with whom this nation was ever blessed. His memory is still held in profound veneration; his posterity enjoy the greatest privileges; and his works are of the highest authority. Before the end of the fourth dynasty we find the country divided into no less than twenty principalities or kingdoms. But the several parts of the empire were re-united by Lieu-pang (alias Kau-tsu), the founder of the HAN dynasty (207), which was the most illustrious that ever reigned in China; and from this epoch, the Chinese history is curious and interesting.

At the commencement of the sixth dynasty (A.D. 220) China was divided into three separate states: and though these were re-united by Se-ma-yeu, the founder of the TSIN dynasty about fifteen years after he ascended the throne (280), yet the country was, soon after, the seat of incessant hostilities and contending parties: every province becoming the prey of the most powerful invader. The history of this troublesome period affords little that is interesting to posterity. After a succession of various dynasties the country was at length reduced by the Moguls under Kublay khân (1279), who was crowned emperor, under the title of Tchi-tsou, and thus founded the dynasty of IWEN. This prince was a great patron of the arts and sciences; and neglected nothing that could contribute to the glory of his empire or the happiness of his subjects. But the Moguls were soon enervated by the plea-

sures that accompany peace and security. Tchu-yuen-tchang (a Chinese of mean extraction) seized the favourable opportunity of delivering his country from the dominion of a foreign yoke; and, being crowned emperor by his followers, assumed the title of Hong-vu; and thereby founded the dynasty of the Tming (1368).

The Mantchew Tatars revolted from the empire (1616): and their progress under their victorious leader Tay-tsong alarmed the reigning monarch*. The country became a prey to intestine commotions and civil wars. Whey-tsong, the last of the Chinese emperors, was deposed by his own rebellious subjects, who were every where in arms against each other: and the Tatars succeeded at last in establishing Xun-tchi, the nephew of Tay-tsong, on the throne (1644). In the course of seven years the whole country was subjected to the power of the Tatars (1649): in whose possession it still remains.

THIBET.

The early history of this country, like that of all the eastern nations, is involved in impenetrable obscurity. It was formerly divided into a number of independent sovereignties, the principal of which was Tufân. These were probably tributary to the Chinese; but, in process of time, became united, and threw off their dependence on that empire. We know but little more of their history than the occasional mention of them in their various contests with the emperors of China: to whom, at last, they were obliged to submit (A.D. 1125). The Mogul emperor, Kublay khân, divided this country into several provinces, and gave to the *Lama* the title of prince or king; which was bestowed also on several of his successors. Towards the year 1373 Yong-lo, the emperor of China, gave to eight Lamas the title of king. About the year 1426 they

* From the year 1627 to 1635.

all took the title of Grand Lama : and the first of these Lamas took the title of Dalai-lama. This is the origin of the Dalai-lama, or Grand Lama of Thibet. The country is still, in some measure, dependent on China.

MONGOLIA.

This immense tract of country (usually called Great Tatary), which lies to the north of Thibet and China, stretching from Mantchew Tatary in the east to Great Buccharia in the west, was anciently inhabited (as, indeed, it is at present) by various tribes ; who, under the name of Turks or Tatars, assumed a degree of absolute power within their own districts ; but who were all dependent on some superior state, either foreign or domestic. The early history of this country is dull and uninteresting till the beginning of the thirteenth century; when the remarkable exploits of one enterprising chief raised it from obscurity, and established an empire which then involved the fate of all Asia, and which has since been the astonishment of posterity.

About the year A. D. 1182 we find Ung Khân (or Prester John of Asia, as he is sometimes called by the Europeans) prince of the tribe of Kara-its, a very powerful sovereign, and the greatest part of this country tributary to him. It was at this period that Temudjin, a young prince of the tribe of the Moguls (or perhaps more properly Monguls), took refuge in his court, and sought his protection against his rebellious subjects. Ung Khân received him with kindness, gave him his daughter in marriage, and restored him to his dominions. But, afterwards fearing the power of so valiant a prince, he attempted to assassinate him (1202); on which, a rupture took place that put all Tatary in motion. In the very first engagement, Temudjin defeated the troops of Ung Khân;

seized on his dominions; and, soon after, got himself proclaimed sovereign under the title of ZINGHIS KHAN (1206).

Under the auspices of this monarch, the Mogul empire arrived to a degree of power and splendour unprecedented in ancient or in modern times. After reducing the whole of this country to his subjection, he turned his arms against the Kin empire, which had lately demanded their customary tribute. He invaded the northern parts of China, then in their possession (1211); and next marched into the west, to chastise the emperor of Karasm (1218). In the course of a year or two he made himself master of Great Buccharia, committing every where the most horrid excesses: and in the following year he not only reduced Karasm, but effected the conquest of all the country to the mountains of Elwend (1221); comprehending all Media Magna and its dependencies. His victorious army then marched in triumph round the Caspian sea, through the country of the Kipjâks in Russia, which was reduced to his dominion (1223). He undertook the war, in person, against the two empires of Hya and the Kin Tatars. The former he soon destroyed (1227): but, before he commenced any active operations against the latter, he was taken ill, and died in the sixty-fifth year of his age, after a reign of twenty-two years (1228).

Zinghis Khân left the dominion of his empire between his four sons, Tushi, Zagatay, Octay, and Touli; who eventually shared amongst them his immense possessions. Tushi was invested with the country situated to the north of the Caspian and Euxine seas; and known by the name of Kipjâk. Zagatay succeeded to the provinces of Great Buccharia, Thibet, and the northern parts of India; and gave the name of Zagatays to his dynasty. Touli had Korasân together with some of the neighbouring provinces; but died soon after his father. Whilst Octay held the rest of the empire. Firmly united, for their own and the public interest, these separate dominions might still be considered but as one kingdom; since the will

of Octay (on whom was bestowed the title of Grand Khân) directed the whole affairs of the government; and under his auspices the empire was considerably enlarged and improved. He pursued the war against the Kin; and, with the assistance of the Chinese, put an end to their kingdom (1234). He next turned his arms towards the north-west; and in a few years, with the assistance of his nephew Batû (who had succeeded his father Tushi in the Kipjâk country) not only reduced the immense empire of Russia (1237), but struck terror into the neighbouring kingdoms. His cousin Kublay, or Hu-pi-lay, effected the conquest of China: and ascended the throne of that empire under the title of Tchi-tsou (1279).

Thus, Tatary became closely united to the vast empire of China; and remained so, nearly ninety years; till at length the Moguls were driven out of China (1368)*, and once more confined within the limits of their own kingdom. Stript of their conquests the Mogul emperors fell into insignificance: and Tatary became again divided into a number of different independent tribes; who still, however, preserved the imperial title in one of these families. These princes, quarrelling amongst themselves, paved the way for their own subjugation. Tay-tsong, the victorious chief of the Mantchew Tatars, who had lately revolted from the Chinese, taking advantage of these divisions, found means to reduce them one after another; and thus they became in some measure a province to his new empire (1630). The Mantchews having afterwards subdued the whole of China (1649), these three countries have ever since been inseparably united: and Tatary is now held as a dependency on the Chinese empire.

* From the death of Kublay (1294) we may date the final separation of the Mogul empire. The Khâns of Kipjâk and Russia, the Khâns of Zagatay or Transoxiana, and the Khâns of Irân or Persia (the three principal branches of the house of Zinghis Khân), no longer acknowledged their dependence on the Great Khân who resided at Caracoom.

USBEC TATARY.

That part of Tatary which is at present inhabited by the Usbecs (sometimes called Little Tatary) is one of the finest countries in all Asia; and has been the seat of many powerful kingdoms. Its early history is uninteresting or unknown; but it probably formed part of the ancient Persian monarchy: for it was visited by Alexander the Great as one of the provinces of that empire in B.C. 329. It continued in the possession of Alexander and his successors on the Syrian throne till the reign of Antiochus Theos; when Theodotus, the governor of the province, raised the standard of revolt, and founded the kingdom of Bactria (250). His descendants kept possession of the throne till they were driven out by the Scythians or Tatars: who, at the instigation of the Parthians, invaded the country and put an end to the dominion of the Greeks (126).

We know but little of the subsequent history of this country till it was conquered by the Saracens (A.D. 707); under whose dominion it remained till the revolt of Nasr, the great grandson of Sammani (874), who founded the dynasty of the Sammanians in this country. His brother Ismael reduced Korasân (902), and put an end to the dynasty of the Soffarids. His descendants held it till the reign of Abul Hareth Mansûr Ebn Nuh, who was deposed by his subjects (998). Mahmûd Ebn Sabektekîn then seized upon the throne, and founded the dynasty of the Gasnevîds*. He assumed the title of Sul-

* Mahmûd was commander-in-chief of the unfortunate monarch's army; and also a lord or prince of Gasni, a city near the confines of India. From this circumstance he is sometimes called Mahmûd Gasni; and his descendants, Gasnevids. The dynasty of the Gasnevids is, by some, reckoned to commence from Sabektekin in 975: but *his* power was not universally acknowledged. A modern traveller, who had visited the city of Gasni, observes that "with the exception of some scattered masses of mishapen ruins, not a monument is to be seen of Gasni's former grandeur."

tan; and, having firmly established his dominion at home, commenced a victorious and sanguinary career by the invasion of India (1000), where he carried on a most destructive war for many years; exterminating the peaceable Hindoos, and their religion, with the most enthusiastic fury and unrelenting zeal; and firmly establishing his dominion over the conquered countries. He next turned his arms against Persia; and, having subdued Persian Irâk, put an end to the dynasty of the Bowids in that country (1029). The Seljukian Turks, under Togrul Bey, afterwards reduced this country (1042): and thus was the mighty empire of the Gasnevids reduced to their Indian possessions beyond the Indus.

This country continued under the Seljukian Turks till Kothboddîn, one of the provincial vice-roys, found means to throw off the yoke and to establish a new dynasty (1097). He assumed the title of Karasm Shâh; and his descendants are still known by the name of Karasmians. Takash, one of his successors, firmly established this empire by the final destruction of the Seljuk power in Persia (1194), which he added to his own dominions. But Zinghis Khân, the celebrated Mogul chief, at length invaded his dominions, and deprived him of his territories (1219). On the death of that illustrious warrior, however, he left these dominions to his son Zagatay, who for some time acknowledged a sort of dependence on the Grand Khân in Tatary: but, in course of time this country threw off its allegiance, and was governed by its own princes, called Zagatays, from the name of their founder (1294).

On the declension of the power of the Khâns of Zagatay, this country fell into great confusion; which gave an opportunity to Timur Bey* one of the nobles of the kingdom, and probably a descendant from Zinghis Khân, to raise himself to the supreme command. The conquests of this prince, however, were greater than those of his illustrious predeces-

* He is sometimes called Tamerlane; which is a corruption of the two words Timûr *lenc* (lame).

sor. He made Samarcand the capital of his dominions: and after firmly establishing his authority (1370) turned his arms against the sultan of Korasân (1380), and pursued his victorious career not only by the reduction of all Persia, and the abolition of the petty dynasties that had arisen from the ruins of the Seljukin power in that country (1393); but also by the invasion of Turkestân, Kipjâk, and the contiguous nations of Russia, Georgia, and other places: all of which he reduced to his dominion. He afterwards entered India (1397); polluting every where his footsteps with the most horrid carnage; and next made an irruption into Asia Minor and Syria (1402); and soon after died on his march to the invasion of China (1405). But nearly the whole of these immense conquests were lost to his successors, who (by some historians) are called Timourids; and who inherited only the kingdoms of Transoxiana and Persia. On the decease of Shâh Rûk, the empire became again divided (1446): for, the three rebellious grandchildren of Timûr disputed the possession of Persia; whilst the eldest son of Shâh Rûk (the celebrated Ulugh Bey) succeeded him in his Transoxian dominions, or the present Usbec Tatary. But, the relation of such disgraceful contests can afford neither amusement nor instruction: and it will be sufficient to remark that one of the last descendants of Timûr, that reigned over a portion of this divided country, was Sultan Babr, who was deprived of his dominions by the Usbec Tatars (1498) and driven into India, where he established the Mogul empire. The Usbec Tatars derived their name from Usbec, the eighth Khân of Kipjâk descended from Zinghis Khân; which his subjects assumed in honour of him for having introduced the Mohammedan religion into his dominions. They invaded this country in 1494 under Shâh Bakht Soltân, who soon reduced the whole of it to his subjection. At present, Great Buccharia is divided amongst a number of independent tribes, each under its respective khân; who all pride themselves in being descended from the illustrious Timûr.

HINDOSTAN.

The ancient history of Hindostân is very imperfect: since the north-western provinces only were known to the Persians and Greeks; through whose writings we acquire all our information respecting this country. It appears that the territory about the head waters of the Indus was conquered by Darius: and it is well known that, when Alexander the Great overturned the Persian empire, he marched his victorious army into this part of the country (B.C. 328). But, though he reduced the provinces as far as the Hyphasis (one of the branches of the Indus), yet the brave resistance of the natives and the revolt of his soldiers obliged him to desist from further conquests. Alexander erected the territory, which he had subdued, into a province, by the name of Paropamisus: and it remained with him and his successors on the Syrian throne, till the revolt of the Parthians (250). But, from this period we are almost entirely ignorant of the transactions of this country till about the tenth century of the Christian æra*.

The authentic history of Hindostân commences with the invasion of Mahmûd Gasni the sovereign of Karasm about the year A.D. 1000: and though, in his first expedition, he reduced only the province of Moultân, yet in the course of a few years he made himself master of all the country north-west of the Nerbuddah river (1024), destroying the Hindoo religion wherever he went. On the payment of a tribute the rajahs (or princes) preserved their dominions; and the people, their lives and fortunes. But to the religion of Hindostân the

* It should be observed, in this early part of the history of Hindostân, that the country to the *west* of the river Indus has almost always been subject to those powers who have governed in Persia or Buccharia: and the history of *this* part of Hindostân will consequently be found in the account of those countries.

zealous mosleman was cruel and inexorable. Many hundred temples were levelled with the ground; and many thousand idols demolished. His footsteps were every where marked with persecution and destruction. When the empire of Gasni fell to pieces (1042), his Indian possessions were suffered to remain in the hands of the reigning monarch: but the posterity of this prince was driven out, from this territory also, by the new dynasty of the Gaurids (1183); who in a short time found means to extend their dominions as far as Benares (1194).

On the death of Mohammed Gauri (1208) his possessions were divided: and the Patan or Afgan empire was founded by Cuttub, who had the Indian part. He fixed his imperial seat at Delhi: and his successor, Altumish, conquered the greatest part of Hindostân proper (1210). Soon after this, the Moguls began to make irruptions into this country: and, though they did not at first make any permanent conquests, they were at length permitted to settle in some of the frontier provinces (1292). The reigning emperor at this time was Ferose II; who, in the following year, projected the conquest of the Deccan (1293). This enterprise was transiently accomplished by Alla, governor of Gurrah (1310); who afterwards murdered the emperor and usurped the throne *. Timûr Bey ravaged this country with fire and sword, committing every where the most dreadful excesses (1397). After a terrible devastation and destruction, he retired; and did not disturb the succession of the empire, or seize on any part of the dominions, except the Panjab country which he reserved to himself: but his successors did not keep it long.

On the death of Mahmûd III (1413), the Patan dynasty, founded by Cuttub, became extinct: and the throne was successively filled by the most powerful of the rival chiefs. These commotions and divisions rendered the country an easy prey

* It was during the commotions that followed these events that the provinces of Bengal, Guzerat, the Panjab and the Deccan were lost to the empire (1344).

to Sultan Bâbr, a descendant of Timûr Bey, who reigned in Great Buccharia. Bâbr had been driven from his dominions by the Usbec Tatars; and, after an ineffectual stand against those powerful invaders, turned his arms against this country (1518); a great part of which (after five repeated invasions) he at length reduced (1525), and thereby founded the Mogul empire in India. His grandson the celebrated Ackbar (who ascended the throne in 1555, at the age of fourteen) found means not only to establish his authority, but also greatly to extend the limits of his empire. The conquest of the Deccan (which was commenced in 1585) was not finally accomplished till the reign of the emperor Aureng Zîb, or Aurungzebe, at the close of the seventeenth century. On the death of this last monarch (1707), who was at this period the most powerful in all Asia, the country fell again into great confusion. The provinces west of the Indus were seized by the Persians (1713) *, and the viceroy of the Deccan aspired at independence (1722). The dissolution indeed of the empire seemed now fast approaching: and towards the middle of the century nothing remained to the family of Timûr, but a small tract of country round the city of Delhi (now no longer a capital) which was exposed to the repeated depredations of the various states which had assumed independence in the country.

In the year 1765 the English established themselves in this country by obtaining from the nominal sovereign of Hindostân a confirmation of their right to the sovereignty of Bengal. They afterwards extended their conquest into the Rohilla country, and obtained the cession of Benares and other districts (1775). By the reduction of Seringapatam (1792), no less than one half of the dominions of Tippoo Saib were ceded to the English and their allies: and in 1799 the whole of his king-

* On the death of Nadîr Shah (1747), Abdallah, one of his generals, seized on the eastern parts of Persia, together with these ceded provinces of India, and erected them into an independent kingdom, still known by the name of Candahar, or Abdalli. The residence of the sovereign is at Cabûl.

dom was conquered by Marquis Wellesley. The subjugation of Holkar (1805) and his dominions was the last important conquest in this quarter. The Great Mogul is now a prisoner in the hands of the English, who rule with arbitrary sway over the imperial provinces.

ARABIA.

This country may be divided into three parts, Arabia Deserta, Arabia Petræa, and Arabia Felix. The latter district appears never to have been conquered by any foreign power: but the former (and perhaps Arabia Petræa) has occasionally submitted to the several victorious states that at different times carried their conquests into those parts of Asia. We know but few particulars, however, of the history of Arabia, till Mohammed, their celebrated prophet, made himself the head of a sect which in the course of a few years disseminated their doctrine over the whole country (A. D. 622), and whose successors extended both their religion and their conquests over the greater part of the known world. They first invaded Syria (632), which together with Palestine they soon reduced (639). The victorious general next turned his arms against Egypt, which submitted to the conqueror (640). Shusistân, Media Atropatene, part of Armenia, and the whole empire of Persia submitted also (648) to the dominion and religion of the Arabs, who are perhaps better known in history by the name of Saracens. During the reign of Al Walîd I, the Saracens, after finishing the conquest of Africa (709), made a descent in Spain (712), and in a short time reduced the whole to the authority of the caliph *.

These sovereigns afterwards removed the seat of their empire to Bagdad (768): whence they are styled Caliphs of

* The Saracens in Spain soon after rendered themselves independent of these caliphs (755).

Bagdad. On the death of the celebrated Haroun Al Rashîd (809), the empire of the Caliphs became a prey to intestine commotions and dissentions. The rebellious governors of the different provinces frequently hoisted the standard of revolt, and successively shook off their dependence on the empire; as will be explained in the separate history of each state. The western provinces of Africa were seized by the Aglabites and Edrisites (800). The Taherians had established themselves in Korasan (820): Syria and Egypt were erected into an independent state by the Tolunids (878): and towards the end of the ninth century the Karmatians had dispossessed the Caliphs of Bagdad of the whole of their dominions in Arabia. As different emirs had established themselves in independence over other provinces, there remained to the Caliphs of Bagdad nothing but the shadow of authority; and they lived under the protection of their more powerful neighbours, who often treated them with insolence and contempt; till their dominion was finally subverted by Hulagou Khân (1258). The subsequent history of Arabia is uninteresting or unknown till the end of the late century; when it appears to have been reduced by the Wahabees.

KORASAN.

The ancient Hyrcania comprehended nearly the present Karasm, Korasân, and the province of Mazenderân. Parthia was a small district in Korasân, which afterwards rose to such eminence as to give its name to the whole country. It had probably long formed part of the Persian empire, when it was overturned by Alexander the Great: but on the decease of that illustrious warrior it eventually fell under the dominion of the Seleucidæ, who held it till the reign of Antiochus Theos.

At this period, Arsaces, a man of obscure origin, excited a revolt (B.C. 250); and, having seized on Párthia, thereby

laid the foundation of the Parthian empire. His descendants are called the Arsacidæ, and kept possession of the throne during a period of four hundred and seventy-five years. Mithridates I reduced Persia and Media; and overran, in a manner, all the East, extending his dominions into India beyond the bounds of Alexander's conquests (145). He afterwards got possession of Babylonia and Mesopotania (141). The contiguity of the Parthians to the Roman possessions in the east involved them in frequent and furious wars with that empire, which were carried on with various success till the reign of Artabanus, who lost the flower of his army in one of these contests. This event encouraged Artaxerxes, a Persian of mean descent, to revolt from the Parthians (A. D. 226).

This country afterwards underwent all the revolutions of Persia; and was conquered by the Saracens soon after they invaded that kingdom (648). On the declension of the power of the Caliphs, it revolted under Taher, who founded the dynasty of the Taherians (820). This dynasty was overturned by the Soffarids (872); who possessed themselves of Korasân, Tabristân, Segistân, and other neighbouring provinces. Only three princes of this family ascended the throne: the last was deposed by Ismael Sammani (902). This dynasty was supplanted by the Gasnevids (998): and from this period Korasân may be considered as having undergone nearly the same revolutions as Persia at large. At least its separate history is uninteresting or unknown.

PERSIA.

It is generally admitted that this country was originally peopled by Elam the son of Shem: and the first king that we find mentioned is Chedorlaomer, who extended his conquests over many provinces in Asia. After this, nothing occurs worth notice in the history of Persia till the time of

Cyrus, who is universally allowed to be the founder of that mighty empire which was long the glory and the terror of the East. Cyrus was related both to the king of Persia and the king of Media, and under the auspices of this latter monarch he effected the conquest of Lydia and the several provinces in Asia Minor (B. C. 548); and afterwards the destruction of the Babylonian empire (538). Shortly after this event, Cyaxares probably succeeded to the government of the whole united empire of the Medes and Persians (536). In the first year of his reign he published the famous edict whereby the Jews were allowed to return to Jerusalem and rebuild their temple; restoring to them, at the same time, all the sacred vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had brought from that city. His son Cambyses reduced Egypt to his subjection (525), and afterwards lost his army by attempting to penetrate into Ethiopia.

During the reign of Darius the Ionians revolted; and, with the assistance of the Athenians, took the city of Sardis (504), which they burnt to the ground. In revenge for this affront, Darius determined to carry the war into the heart of Greece. The issue of this contest is known to every classical reader. An immense army of 100,000 men was landed in Eubœa, and proceeded towards Attica: but they were bravely repulsed by Miltiades with a force of only 10,000, at the battle of Marathon (490). Xerxes, his son and successor, renewed the attempt. The Grecians bravely, though unsuccessfully, disputed his passage at the streights of Thermopylæ (480); an action which shines conspicuous in the page of Grecian history.

The last prince of this dynasty was Darius Codomannus, in whose reign happened the memorable invasion of Persia by Alexander the Great (334). By a series of brilliant victories (which are related under the history of Macedon) he made himself master of all the strong places: and, on the death of Darius (330), the whole empire submitted to his

arms, whereby an end was put to the Persian monarchy. On the death of Alexander this country became involved in all those disputes which arose between his ambitious generals. But it eventually fell under the dominion of the Seleucidæ, who held it till the time of the civil wars between Demetrius Nicanor and Tryphon; when Mithridates king of Parthia seized on it (141), and annexed it to his own empire.

It underwent all the revolutions of that state till the reign of Artabanus; when Artaxerxes, a Persian of obscure origin, seized the favourable opportunity of revolting, drove out the family of the Arsacidæ, and was himself proclaimed king (A. D. 226). The name of his father was Sassan; whence, his descendants are usually styled the Sassanides. In 302 the Persians were obliged to cede Mesopotamia to the Romans: which however they recovered again (together with some other provinces) in 363. Chosroes II invaded the Roman provinces (603), and in the course of a few years (616) over-ran Mesopotamia, Syria, and great part of Asia Minor; together with Phœnicia, Palestine, Egypt, and Libya: thereby threatening the very existence of the Roman power in Asia. But the emperor Heraclius at length took the field with a large army (622); and eventually recovered all these conquests (627).

The glory of the house of Sassan ended with the life of Chosroes (628): for, on his death, the country became a prey to intestine disputes and commotions. The last Persian monarch was Isdigerd, whose reign was short and unhappy. The Saracens, about this period, turned their victorious arms against this country (636).) The western provinces immediately submitted to the conquerors: and, in the course of a few years, the whole of his dominions were reduced (648). On the decline of the power of the Caliphs, several petty sovereignties were formed in this country; the principal of which were those of the Deylamites and Bowids. The Deylamite dynasty commenced in the year 927; but never made any conspicuous figure in history. The Bowids on the one side, and the Gas-

nevids on the other, at length deprived them of their territories (1012). The empire of the Bowids, or the Bûyian dynasty, was established in 933, and was often divided and sub-divided: which makes it extremely difficult to follow their history. The Gasnevids destroyed one branch (1029); and the Seljuks the remaining ones (1043). The Bowids ruled over the greatest part of modern Persia, together with Babylonia and several of the neighbouring provinces.

The whole of this country was, however, eventually reduced by Togrul Bey, who established the empire of the Seljuks. He began his victorious career by the invasion of Korasân (1038); and in the course of a few years reduced all the country between Ispahan and the Oxus (1043). His descendants successively added Armenia (1068), Syria and Palestine (1076), together with Mesopotamia and the whole of Asia Minor (1084) to his dominions: and thus raised the empire of the Seljuks to the highest pitch of glory and renown. The greatness and unity of the Seljukian empire expired in the person of Malek Shâh (1092). The divisions * which he had made, during his lifetime, were a source of civil discord at his death; and, after a series of domestic wars, the princes who ruled over the greatest part of Persia finally became a separate branch of the Seljukian dynasty; and are hereafter distinguished in history by the name of the Seljuks of Irân. They were in general a race of very accomplished princes; eminent for their courage, liberality, and justice: but they were at length obliged to submit to the superior power of the Karasmians, who put an end to their dominion (1194).

The empire of the Karasmians was overturned by Zinghis Khân (1221): and Persia was ruled by governors appointed by the Great Khân of Tatary, who lived in a great measure independent. They utterly extirpated the Bâtanists or Assassins in Assyria

* Hence arose the three principal dynasties of the Seljuks; known in history by the names of the Seljuks of Irân, of Roum, and of Kermân.

(1257) : and next put an end to the Caliphate of Bagdad (1258). They afterwards over-ran Syria and Armenia : but their conquests in these countries were not permanent. On the death of Abusaid, several dynasties sprang up, which gave rise to intestine commotions* : and these disorders did not cease till the time of Timûr Bey; who soon reduced Persia to his subjection (1393). On the decease of Shâh Rûk, the son of Timûr, the country fell again into great disorder (1446), and was divided into a number of petty states, which claimed independence of each other. These were again united under one government by the Ac Koyunlu, or family of the White Sheep; who were driven out by the celebrated Ismael Sofi, the founder of the late dynasty of the Shâhs, who commenced his victorious career by the capture of Shirwân and Aderbitzan (1500); and, having put an end to the dynasty of the Ac Koyunlu (1508), in a few years reduced the whole of this country to his subjection (1510), together with the neighbouring provinces of Babylonia and Assyria.

The Russians seized on some of the northern provinces of Russia in 1722; but they were driven out by Nadir Shâh (1730), who afterwards usurped the throne and put an end to the dominion of the Sofis (1736). On his death the country was torn to pieces by the factions of many rival competitors, which continued many years. The grandees of the state at length acknowledged for the sovereign the present king Fath Ali Shâh (1796), who established his residence at Teherân. This prince soon became involved in a war with Russia, who had taken possession of Georgia, and threatened his dominions. Indeed, what with the encroachments of the Russians and Turks on one side, and the rebellious state of the provinces on the other, the Persians at the present day possess but a small portion of their once splendid and extensive empire.

* One of the principal of these dynasties was that of the Ilkhaniens; who took possession of Babylonia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, and some other neighbouring provinces. See Babylonia.

MEDIA.

This country is supposed to have taken its name from Madai, the third son of Japhet: but Herodotus says it was derived from Medea. No credible accounts have been recorded of the reigns and transactions of its ancient kings. It was probably formerly subject to the kings of Assyria; but the history of this early period is very uncertain: at length, however, the inhabitants found means to throw off the yoke. They lived then for a short time in a state of anarchy, till they chose Dejoces for their king (B.C. 710), who re-united the several districts of the state. His son and successor Phraortes about the middle of the seventh century reduced the greatest part of Asia Minor from the borders of the river Halys to the confines of the Assyrian empire. Cyaxares, in conjunction with Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, laid siege to Nineveh: and, having taken that city, levelled it with the ground; thereby putting an end to the Assyrian monarchy (601). The country was divided between the two conquerors. On the death of Cyaxares II, it is probable that Cyrus succeeded him in the empire, and thereby united the two contiguous states of Media and Persia (536). The future revolutions of these united kingdoms will therefore more properly fall under the history of Persia.

ASSYRIA.

The commencement, extent, and duration of this ancient kingdom are very uncertain. It is supposed by some to have been founded by Ashur, the second son of Shem, who laid the foundation of Nineveh. Ninus, his successor, seized on Chaldæa after the death of Nimrod; and is said to have subdued Persia, Media, Egypt, &c.: but if he did so, the effects of

his conquests could be but of short duration, for in the days of Abraham we do not find that any of the neighbouring kingdoms were subject to Assyria. Ninus was succeeded by his wife Semiramis, a woman of wonderful address, talents, and courage; and whose conquests raised the Assyrian name to a great degree of eminence. The accounts, however, which are given of this personage are supposed to be altogether fictitious, and therefore must be received with caution. After Semiramis we find a long list of kings, all of whom lived an effeminate and worthless life, down to Sardanapalus the last of the race; and who is said to have been dethroned by Arbaces the Mede and Belesis the Babylonian (B.C.820). No part of this history, however, rests on very good authority; and the first authentic records of this kingdom begin with Pul, who is supposed to have been the founder of it (771). This monarch divided his dominions at his death between his two sons, Tiglath Pileser and Nabonassar. The former succeeded him in this country (747): and, soon after, reduced Syria to his empire (740). His son and successor, Shalmanezer, conquered Hosea king of Israel; and subjected that kingdom also to his dominion (721)*.

In the first year of the reign of Esarhaddon, the Medes revolted, and separated from the kingdom of Assyria (710). This loss was, in some measure, compensated by the subsequent capture of Babylon (681); which he united to his empire: but it soon after resumed its independence (626). The Assyrian empire subsisted some years after this event: but we know little of its history till it was overturned by the Medes and Babylonians (601), and probably divided between the two conquerors.

This country afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the Persian empire† till the reign of Malek Shâh, one of

* See the Second Book of Chronicles, chap. xxxii, verse 21.

† The victorious Trajan reduced Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria, to the state of Roman provinces (A. D. 108): but these conquests were soon lost.

the Seljukian monarchs; when a considerable portion of it was seized, together with the mountainous part of Persia, by Al Hassan a chief of the Bâtanists (A.D. 1090). This remarkable sect, more generally known in Europe by the name of Assassins, afford several singular instances of fanaticism and implicit obedience. Their chief is often styled The Old Man of the Mountains, by the writers on the Crusades: and he was furnished with resources unknown to all other monarchs. For, his subjects (who believed that his will was the declaration of the Divine pleasure) would prostrate themselves at his feet, requesting to die by his hand, or by his order, as a favour by which they were sure of passing into Paradise. With such ready slaves to execute his bloody purposes, he sent inevitable death to all quarters of the world: so that, from one end of the earth to the other, caliphs, emperors, kings, princes, and people of every nation and religion, execrated and dreaded his sanguinary power, from the strokes of which there was no security. They were utterly exterminated by Hulagou Khân (1257), previous to the capture of Bagdad.

This country, being once more annexed to Persia, underwent all the revolutions of that monarchy, till the dynasty of the Ilkhaniens was founded here. They were driven out by Joseph, of the dynasty of Kara Koyunlu (1410). This race was succeeded by the dynasty of the Ac Koyunlu (1468). But, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, it was reduced under the dominion of the Persians. The Turks took it in 1534: but it was recovered again in 1554. It was, however, finally reduced by the Turks, in the reign of Amurath IV (1638), and still remains in their possession.

BABYLONIA.

Babylonia, or Chaldæa, is one of the oldest kingdoms in the world; being founded by Nimrod the grandson of Ham,

who also (according to the margin of our Bibles) founded Nineveh the capital of Assyria. Indeed these two kingdoms seem to have continued always in such a state of friendship, that we can scarcely help thinking they must have been the same: or, perhaps Babylon was for some time a province of Assyria. Nothing certain is known of either of them, except what may be gathered from Scripture. On the death of Pul, who either founded or revived the Assyrian empire, he left his dominions to be divided between his two sons, Tiglath Pileser and Nabonassar: the latter succeeded to the throne of Babylon (B. C. 747)*. As the two kingdoms were governed by princes of the same family, we may well suppose a perfect harmony to have existed between them. There is but little, however, that is interesting in the early history of this country: and we find it again soon reduced to subjection by Esar-Haddon, king of Assyria (681).

It remained part of that empire till the revolt of Nabopolassar, who seized on the government himself, and was proclaimed king (626). His son Nebuchadnezzar, in conjunction with the Medes, put an end to the Assyrian empire, which was divided between the two conquerors (601); and shortly after reduced the kingdom of Judah (588). This mighty conqueror next turned his arms against several other neighbouring nations, all of which he easily reduced: but was unable to retain his conquests. The last monarch who ruled over this ancient kingdom was Nabonadius (the Belshazzar of the Scriptures). The kingdom of Media had, about this time, risen to great eminence under the wise and vigorous administration of Cyrus; who, having conquered several of the surrounding nations, directed his march towards Babylon. Being foiled in his attempts to take this city in the regular manner, Cyrus hit on the following stratagem. He diverted the course of the river which ran through the city; and taking

* The *æra of Nabonassar* is dated from this epoch; and it is likewise the commencement of those Astronomical Observations of the Chaldæans, which Ptolemy has transmitted to us.

advantage of a grand festival kept by the Babylonians, when they were all carousing and inebriated, he forced a passage along the bed of the river into the heart of the palace. The guards were dispersed, and their king slain (agreeably to the prediction of Daniel) on the same evening when he saw the hand-writing on the wall.

This kingdom afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the Persian empire till the death of Alexander the Great; soon after which, this country was allotted to Seleucus: and after the decisive battle of Ipsus (301) he raised himself to the state of an independent monarch. His successors kept possession of the throne of Syria for many centuries; and are known in history by the name of the Seleucidæ.

This country then underwent all the revolutions of the Syrian empire, till it was seized by the Parthians (141): and was then successively reduced by the Persians and Saracens; as related under the history of Persia. Whilst it was under the dominion of the Saracens, the caliphs removed the seat of empire to Bagdad (A.D. 766); a city, which on the declension of their power in the tenth century, long continued (together with some part of the surrounding country) the *sole* remains of their once powerful monarchy.

Their empire was however finally overturned by Hulagou Khân (1258); and became annexed to the empire of the Moguls in Persia; the revolutions of which it underwent till the death of Abusaid Khân (1335), when Hassan Bouzrouk (sometimes also called Hassan Nuiyan Ilekani), one of his descendants, founded the dynasty of the Ilkhaniens in this country.

Kara Yusef, (or Joseph) the Turcoman of the dynasty of Kara Koyunlu, afterwards seized it (1410): whose descendants held it till they were vanquished by the rival house of Ac Koyunlu (1468). The family of this prince continued till Shâh Ismael, the sovereign of Persia, drove them out (1508), and annexed the country to his own empire. It was seized by Soliman emperor of the Turks in 1534; but re-

covered again by Shâh Abbas before the year 1612. It was, however, a second time reduced by the Turks in 1638 under Amurath IV; and remains in their hands at the present day.

SYRIA.

Syria was anciently divided into a number of petty states; of which the principal were Zobah, Damascus, Hamath, and Geshur. Their history is to be found in the Bible: where it will appear that Tiglath Pileser king of Assyria invaded Syria; and, having carried away the inhabitants into captivity, thereby put an end to the Syrian monarchy (B.C.740). This country then underwent all the revolutions of the Assyrian empire till the death of Alexander the Great, when it became the cause and the scene of contention amongst his ambitious generals. After the decisive battle of Ipsus (301), Seleucus, the governor of Babylonia, assumed the dominion over Syria, and likewise over all the Greek provinces lying between the Indus and the Euphrates. He built the city of Antioch on the Orontes (300); and, removing the seat of government from Babylon, made this the capital of his empire, assuming the title of king of Syria: and was thus the founder of that race of kings which, for near two centuries and a half, kept possession of the throne of Syria, under the name of the Seleucidæ. He extended his powerful empire by the reduction of several places in Asia Minor (281). Antiochus the Great invaded Phœnicia and Palestine, which readily submitted to his victorious arms (203); but he soon after lost the whole of his possessions in Asia Minor (190). His son Antiochus Epiphanes endeavoured to bring over his subjects, in every part of the empire, to the religion of the Greeks. The Jews were the most violent opposers of this oppressive measure: but Antiochus resolved to compel them by force. He invaded Judæa with a large army; profaned the holy temple, and dedicated it to Jupiter

Olympus (168): a step which involved him and his successors in a series of bloody wars with the Jews, and which eventually terminated in their emancipation under the Maccabees (143). During those commotions the Parthians also had greatly abridged the empire of the Seleucidæ by the reduction of many provinces (141): and, soon after, the glory of the Seleucidæ began to decline: the country became a prey to civil discord and confusion; and was repeatedly torn by the various contests for power among the different branches of the royal house.

The subsequent history of Syria is nothing more than a relation of the civil wars carried on by the turbulent and ambitious princes of the race of Seleucus: which favoured the conquest of the country by the Romans, under Pompey (64). It remained in their possession till it was reduced by the Saracens (A.D. 640); when, for two centuries and a half, it obeyed their power. The sovereignty was afterwards alternately contested and enjoyed by the Caliphs of Bagdad and of Egypt: but it was finally reduced under the dominion of the Fatemite dynasty (969). From the Fatemites it afterwards passed to the Seljuks (1076); and on the death of Malek Shâh (1092) became divided into two distinct sovereignties; the princes of which were respectively styled the Sultans of Damascus and of Aleppo. The greatest part of their dominions were seized by the Crusaders, who founded the kingdom of Jerusalem in Palestine, at the latter end of the eleventh century. On the decline of their authority, Emadeddin Zenghi, the son of Acsancar, was appointed to one of the chief offices of state: and under the title of Atâbey* found means to usurp the sovereign power (1127); which was ably supported by his

* Atâbey signifies governor, or father, of a bey or prince. The Seljuks brought with them, from Tatary, a sort of feudal government which they established in all the countries they conquered. The sultan (who resided at Ispahan) distributed the provinces amongst the various governors. These, in process of time, became independent; and, falling into idleness and dissipation, surrendered the cares of government to the officer

son, the celebrated Noureddîn. This enterprising chief recovered from the Franks the lost provinces in Syria (1144); and restored the ancient lustre of the Seljukian throne. His name is frequently mentioned in the history of the Crusades. In 1174, his general Saladîn (or, more properly, Salah-ed-dîn) whose name was afterwards rendered so illustrious throughout Europe, usurped the government of Egypt, where he founded the dynasty of the Ayubites; and then seized upon Syria, which fell an easy prey to his victorious arms. He next made war on the new kingdom of Jerusalem (established by the Crusaders, in Palestine); and stripped it of its most valuable possessions (1187).

The unity of the empire was dissolved at his death; and the jarring interests of rival states were again revived. In the year 1250 it was conquered by the Mamelukes: from whom it was afterwards taken by the Turks (1517), in whose possession it now remains.

PHŒNICIA.

This country was formerly divided into several small kingdoms, like most of the ancient states. Those of Tyre and Sidon, however, appear to have been the most wealthy and powerful; and to have made the greatest figure in history. They long resisted the dominion of the powerful monarchies of Assyria and Babylon: and the siege of Tyre (B.C. 585) is one of the most memorable recorded in history. Nebuchadnezzar however at length reduced the whole country (572). It remained tributary to the Babylonians, and afterwards to the Persians, for the space of seventy years; when, agreeably

nearest his person, who was called the Atâbey. The Atâbey, like the mayors of the Palace, during the seventh century, in France, soon rose to the supreme direction of affairs; and despised the monarch in whose name they governed.

to the prophecy of Isaiah*, it recovered its liberty (502). But, it was probably soon after brought again under the dominion of the Persians. When Alexander the Great invaded Syria (332), this country submitted to his arms: and, after his death, it eventually fell under the dominion of the Ptolemies (301).

It remained in the possession of his successors on the throne of Egypt till it was seized by Antiochus the Great, king of Syria (203): after which, it underwent all the revolutions of that state (as given in the preceding article) till the death of Malek Shâh: soon after which, it became again subject to the dominion of the Fatemites (A.D. 1096). These princes were, however, dispossessed by the Crusaders; who founded the new kingdom of Jerusalem (1099), of which this country formed a part. It was afterwards principally reduced by Bibars, the Mameluke sovereign of Egypt (1268); and by the capture of Acre, the Christians were divested of all their possessions in this country (1291). United to Egypt it underwent all the revolutions of that kingdom; and is now subject to the Turks.

PALESTINE.

This country was anciently inhabited by a number of small tribes or kingdoms, of which we know nothing more than what is occasionally mentioned of them in their various concerns with the children of Israel. The early history of the Jews, who afterwards possessed the greater part of this country, is to be found only in the Bible; and is well known to every one. They may be said to have begun to be a nation upon their leaving Egypt under Moses (B.C. 1491). After wandering about for forty years in the deserts of Arabia, they at length arrived on the borders of the land of Canaan; and made preparations for entering that country under the brave and valiant Joshua (1451). Upon his death (1426), the Is-

* See Isaiah, ch. xxiii, verse 15.

raelites were governed by Elders, and by Judges; till the time of Samuel: when the people became very anxious to have a king to reign over them, like the other nations. Samuel yielding at length to their importunities, anointed Saul to be king of Israel (1095), and thus established the monarchy.

Upon the death of this sovereign (1055), David was proclaimed king by the tribe of Judah, whilst Abner (Saul's general) declared Ishbosheth, the king's son, to be the sovereign: and thus the kingdom was divided for the space of two years: but David was at length anointed and proclaimed king of all Israel (1048). David was succeeded by his son Solomon (1015); on whose death (975) the kingdom was again divided: Rehoboam, his son, was chosen king by the tribes of Judah and Benjamin; and the remaining ten tribes chose Jeroboam. The former was henceforth called the kingdom of JUDAH; and the latter, the kingdom of ISRAEL. After this division, the two nations acted towards each other, at various intervals, according as their interests, their prejudices, or their passions led them. Sometimes we find them entering into alliances with foreign powers against each other, and at other times uniting against a common enemy: at one period strengthening their power by intermarriages between the two royal families, and other marks of a friendly disposition, and at another period stirring up all the flames of dissention and civil discord. The transactions of these times are faithfully and minutely recorded in the holy scriptures, and are too well known to require a repetition in this place. The two kingdoms managed to preserve their independence amidst the continual wars with which they were constantly pressed: for though their enemies, at times, prevailed over them, it was but for a short season. Eventually, however, we find that the kingdom of Israel was reduced by Shalmaneser king of Assyria (721); and the kingdom of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon (588).

The whole of this country then underwent the revolutions of the Babylonian empire, till it was subverted by the

Persians. When Cyrus ascended the throne of Persia, he issued a decree in the first year of his reign (536), by which the Jews were allowed not only to return to their own land, but also to rebuild their temple at Jerusalem, and to take with them all the sacred utensils, which Nebuchadnezzar had carried away. About this time flourished the prophets EZRA, NEHEMIAH, HAGGAI, ZECARIAH, and MALACHI; from whose instruction and advice the Jews received much benefit and improvement. After Nehemiah's death we hear no more of any governors of Judea; but the country appears to have been subject to the prefecture of Syria; and the governors of that province conferred the priesthood on whomsoever they pleased.

When Alexander the Great invaded Asia, this country in common with the rest submitted to his power (332). At his death it became subject to all those dissentions and hostilities which were excited amongst his ambitious successors: but, on the defeat and death of Antigonus at the battle of Ipsus (301), the government of this country was allotted to Ptolemy. It remained annexed to the Egyptian monarchy till Antiochus the Great, king of Syria, seized on it, and united it to the Syrian empire (203). It had not continued in possession of the Seleucidæ many years before a general apostasy took place: the high priesthood was conferred on the highest bidder; the duties and service of the temple were neglected; and oppression and tyranny seemed to pervade the country. An attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to destroy the religion of the Jews (167) finally led to the revolt of the Maccabees (143): who maintained their independence till the Romans rendered them tributary (64); and soon after reduced them to the form of a Roman province (A.D. 6). It remained in this state, subject to the government of Pontius Pilate, till the title of king was once more restored in the person of Agrippa (40). On his death (44) it was again reduced to a Roman province, and had new governors appointed over it, till the revolt in 66. Under Vespasian however the country was soon recovered. Jerusalem was taken by assault, and reduced to ashes; the in-

habitants all cruelly massacred; and an end thereby put to the Jewish nation (70).

Palestine then underwent all the revolutions related under the history of Syria, till the time of the Seljuks; soon after which, the Fatemites recovered their dominion over this country (1096). This was the period of the Crusades. The savage heroes of the cross terminated their sanguinary career by the capture of Jerusalem, and the massacre of its inhabitants (1099). Their gradual and successive conquests (1109) were divided into the four provinces of Edessa, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Tripoli; each under a separate government. Godfrey of Bouillon was elected the first king of Jerusalem, and held the supremacy over the princes of the other provinces. This new kingdom existed nearly two centuries, although continually involved in hostilities with the neighbouring states. Part of Syria and Mesopotamia was recovered by the victorious arms of Zenghi (1144): and Saladîn, who usurped the throne of his successor, drove these Christian invaders from all their possessions in Asia, except Antioch, Tyre, and Tripoli (1187). In the fifth crusade, the emperor Frederic II obtained the restitution of Jerusalem (1228) and several other cities: but the Christians were soon dispossessed again of these (1244). A sixth crusade vainly attempted the restoration of the lost provinces: for, the sad remnant of this Christian kingdom (with the exception of the city of Acre) was seized by Bibars the Mameluke sultan of Egypt (1268); and an end thereby put to their dominion in the East.

Palestine, being thus reduced under the dominion of the Mamelukes, underwent the revolutions of their empire in Egypt; and is now in the hands of the Turks.

ARMENIA MAJOR.

Armenia is said to have been a kingdom in very early days; and probably an independent one: but in process of time it

was rendered tributary to the Medes*; and on the downfall of the Persian monarchy it became subject to the Macedonians (B.C. 334). It remained in their hands till the decisive battle of Ipsus (301), when it came under the dominion of the Seleucidæ; who held it till the reign of Antiochus the Great. That prince had appointed two prefects, Zadriades and Artaxias, to govern Armenia, who excited the people to revolt (223), and each caused himself to be proclaimed king of the province over which he presided. It was on this occasion that the division of Armenia into *Major* and *Minor* was first introduced; a distinction which remains to the present day.

We hear nothing more of this country till the reign of Tigranes II; who enlarged his dominions by the conquest of Armenia Minor and the neighbouring provinces (83). But he was dispossessed of all these conquests by the Romans, who obliged him to content himself with his own paternal kingdom (66). The emperor Trajan reduced Armenia to the form of a Roman province (A.D. 107): but it soon recovered its nominal independence (118), and was long the subject of contention between the Romans and Parthians. The Persians after a contest of thirty years at length reduced it under their dominion (260); but Tiridates, the lawful monarch, was not long after restored by the assistance of the Romans (286). Soon after his death the Persians again conquered it (366). The Romans at length reduced it to the form of a province (580).

The Saracens soon after invaded this country (642), and subjected the whole of it (652). Their dominion however did not continue long; as we find it presently again in the hands of the Greeks. A second attempt was made by the Saracens (687); and, after the reduction of the country (702), they kept possession of it till it was again brought under the dominion of the Greeks at the close of the ninth century, du-

* About the middle of the seventh century before the Christian æra.

ring the reign of the emperor Basil. The Greeks held it till the irruption of the Seljukian Turks; when it was finally conquered by Alp Arslân (1068); who gave it the name of Turcomania.

The Armenians soon shook off the Turkish yoke and chose kings of their own, by whom they were governed till the beginning of the fifteenth century: when the Turcomans of the dynasty of Kara Koyunlu* established themselves here (1403). These Turcomans became afterwards very powerful. They subdued the Ilkhaniens who possessed Bagdad, Mesopotamia, Assyria, and the neighbouring provinces (1410); and afterwards extended their arms into Persia (1452). But they were in their turn reduced by Ussan Cassanes, of the dynasty of Ac Koyunlu* (1468); who greatly extended the limits of his empire by the reduction of Persia and Korasân (1471). His successors quarrelled amongst themselves, and the country became divided among several petty chiefs, who disputed the sovereignty with each other.

In these troublesome times arose the celebrated Shâh Ismael; who by his new doctrines and the interest of his family reduced this country to his dominion (1500); and afterwards gained the throne of Persia. The sultan Selim II conquered Armenia in 1522; since which time it has continued subject to the Turks.

ARMENIA MINOR.

This country underwent all the revolutions of the Greater Armenia, till the revolt of Zadriades and Artaxias (B.C. 223); when it was separated therefrom, and formed a distinct king-

* *Kara Koyunlu* signifies *the black sheep* and *Ac Koyunlu* denotes *the white sheep*; which were the names of the two rival tribes of Turcomans, taken from their warlike standards: in the same manner as we distinguish the former rival houses of York and Lancaster by the appellation of the *White* and *Red Rose*.

dom. The two countries were, however, again united by Tigranes II king of Armenia Major (83); and continued so till the war which broke out with the Romans, when Pompey obliged him to relinquish it (66). At length it was reduced to a Roman province by Vespasian (A.D. 71). Armenia Minor was seized by the Saracens (702): but during the reign of the emperor Basil it again came under the dominion of the Eastern emperors; who held it till it was invaded by the Seljukian Turks (1068). They probably did not keep it long, as we find that, in the beginning of the following century, an Armenian nobleman of the Christian faith assumed the title of king: whose descendants held the throne till the invasion of the Mamelukes who seized upon the country (1374). From the Mamelukes it afterwards fell into the hands of the Turcomans Kara Koyunlu, who had seized upon Armenia Major, as mentioned in the preceding article. But, about the same time, a new and rival state of Turcomans was established in this country, called the Ac Koyunlu; which, in course of time, destroyed the former (1468), and afterwards made themselves masters of all Persia. The subsequent revolutions of this country are the same as those related in the preceding article.

PONTUS.

This country was originally part of Cappadocia. It was in ancient times subject to the kings of Media and Persia, till it submitted to Alexander the Great (B.C. 334). On the death of that illustrious warrior it was long the subject of contention between the other generals; and probably did not acquire independence till after the battle of Ipsus (301).

Mithridates the Great signalized himself in the wars against the Romans, which were the most obstinate and bloody of any in which those republicans were ever engaged. After a contest of near sixty years the Romans reduced Pontus to the

form of a province (63). Marc Antony restored them to their independence (41): but Nero afterwards re-annexed it to the Roman empire (A.D. 43).

It remained in subjection to the Roman and Greek empire till the taking of Constantinople by the Latins (1204)*; when Alexius Comnenus and his brother fled into Asia Minor, seized on Heraclea and the neighbouring country, and assumed the vain title of emperor of Trapezond. The family of the Comneni reigned here two hundred and fifty-eight years: at the end of which period the country was seized by the sultan Mohammed II (1461), who destroyed nearly the whole of the imperial family. It has ever since formed part of the empire of the Turks.

CAPPADOCIA.

The early history of this country is not known: it was probably subject to Media and Persia, and dependent on that empire till the time of Alexander the Great, when it reluctantly submitted to his arms (B.C 334). It then underwent the fate of Pontus till Ariarathes III recovered his paternal kingdom†. On the death of Archelaus the last king of this country, Cappadocia was reduced to the form of a Roman province (A.D. 18). It afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the Greek empire in Asia.

BITHYNIA.

This was a separate kingdom before the time of Crœsus king of Lydia, who conquered Prusias king of this country about B.C. 560. After this it underwent all the revolutions of the Lydian and Persian empire till the death of Alexander

* Subject to a temporary interruption from the Seljuks.

† Probably soon after the battle of Ipsus in the year B. C. 301.

the Great, when it became the source of many contests between his generals. At length it was allotted to Lysimachus, governor of Thrace, on the defeat of Antigonus at the battle of Ipsus (301): and it remained under his dominion till the inhabitants assumed independence, and raised Nicomedes to the throne (281). Nicomedes III, the last of this race, dying without issue, left his kingdom by will to the Romans, who soon after reduced it to the form of a province (70).

It remained in subjection to the Roman and Eastern empire till it was invaded by the Seljukian Turks, who having taken Nice (A. D. 1074) made it at first the capital of a new empire*: but this city was recovered by the aid of the Crusaders (1097); and by the victories of Alexius a great part of Asia Minor was eventually restored to the empire (1114). When Constantinople was taken by the Latins (1204), Theodore Lascaris having escaped from that city, fled to Bithynia; and, by the alliance which he there made, soon reduced the country from the river Meander to the Black sea. He fixed his residence at Nice; whence this new government obtained the title of the empire of Nice. In the reign of John Lascaris, a minor, Michael Palæologus his guardian got himself proclaimed emperor; and, having in the following year taken Constantinople from the Latins, removed the seat of empire from Nice to that ancient metropolis (1261), where he was declared emperor of the East.

Towards the beginning of the fourteenth century Asia Minor was divided into a number of petty states, continually warring with each other. One of these is more deserving of notice than the rest, as being the germ of a mighty empire; which under the celebrated Othmân now first rises into notice. From the conquest of Prusa (1326) we may date the true æra of the Ottoman or Turkish empire. His great grandson Bajazet reduced the whole of Asia Minor to his subjection (1390). His dominions were soon after invaded by Timûr Bey; who by the battle of Angora (1402) got possession of the sultan's

* See PHRYGIA, page 153.

person and his empire. The country was however again brought under subjection by Bajazet II (1482), and has ever since formed part of the Turkish empire. The Turks had in the mean time extended their conquests by the invasion of Europe, and by the capture of Constantinople; which, from that period, became the metropolis of their empire, as already related in the history of THRACE.

LYDIA, MYSIA, AND CARIA.

THESE provinces are situated at the western extremity of Asia Minor; and it is probable that the country was formerly divided into several kingdoms; one of the most celebrated of which was that of Troy. But they were all united under one government by Crœsus king of Lydia, about the year B. C. 560, who extended his conquests to the river Halys. That sovereign having provoked the hostility of the Medes, Cyrus entered Asia Minor with a large army, and put an end to the Lydian monarchy (548). This country afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the Persian empire till the death of Alexander the Great, soon after which it was allotted to Lysimachus king of Thrace (301). It remained in his possession till Philetærus seized on the town and castle of Pergamus (283)*, and assumed the title of *king of Pergamus*. His successor raised this country to a great degree of eminence, and was the constant friend and ally of the Romans; which involved him in successive hostilities with Antiochus king of Syria and Prusias king of Bithynia. The battle of Magnesia (190) was principally gained by his exertions: and the Romans rewarded him with Lydia, Mysia, Phygia, and other neighbouring provinces (190). His son Attalus III left his kingdom to the Romans: but being opposed in the

* Lysimachus was slain in 281: and from this period we may date the authority of these new monarchs.

inheritance they forcibly seized it, and reduced it to the form of a province (129).

It afterwards underwent all the revolutions of the Roman and Eastern empire till it was seized by the Seljukian Turks at the close of the eleventh century of the Christian æra. Its history, from this period, becomes involved in that of the Sultans of Iconium, or Roum, as will be related in the following article.

PHRYGIA.

This country was governed by kings of its own from the earliest periods, till the extinction of the royal family on the death of Adrastus (B.C.635), when it became a province of the Lydian monarchy under Crœsus. It afterwards underwent all the revolutions of that kingdom till the death of Alexander the Great, when it became involved in all those troubles which broke out between his generals in these parts. At length, on the defeat of Antigonus at the battle of Ipsus (301) it was allotted to Lysimachus king of Thrace; and remained in his possession till the battle of Corrupedion (281), when it was seized by Seleucus: but his descendant, Antiochus the Great, reluctantly ceded it to the Romans (190), who bestowed it on Eumenes II king of Pergamus. It afterwards came into the possession of the Romans, as related in the preceding article; and was made a Roman province (129).

Towards the end of the eleventh century of the Christian æra, Solymân, son of Kutlu Muses or Cutulmish, a relation of Malek Shâh the prince of the Seljuks, invaded Asia Minor, and founded the dynasty of the Seljuks of Roum (A.D. 1074). In the course of ten years they had reduced the whole peninsula: but, during the reign of Klidge Arslân, the Greeks recovered that city and some of the neighbouring provinces (1097). On the death of the sultan Masûd the Roumean territory became very much divided; which con-

tinued till the Moguls entered and reduced the country (1243). The Mogul power however soon fell to decay: and on the ruins of it there sprung up a number of petty states, whose perpetual contests with each other would afford neither instruction nor amusement. From one of these little principalities arose the mighty power of the Ottomans, whose rise and progress have been already mentioned. Phrygia soon became annexed to this new empire (1290), and has since followed its vicissitudes and fortune.

CILICIA, LYCIA, &c.

The narrow tract of land, extending along the southern coast of Asia Minor, (commonly called Cilicia) was anciently governed by kings of its own: of whom, however, we know nothing till the reign of Cyrus, king of Persia, to whom they voluntarily submitted (B. C. 548). It is probable that they were dependent on that monarchy when Alexander the Great invaded this country (334). On his death it became involved in all those disputes which broke out between Alexander's generals; till, on the defeat of Antigonus at the battle of Ipsus (301), it was ultimately bestowed on Pleistarchus. Seleucus, however, soon after, seized it (298); but his son, Antiochus Soter, was deprived of it in the war with Ptolemy Philadelphus (264): and it remained in possession of the Ptolemies* till it was conquered by Pompey (64).

It continued under the dominion of the Roman and Eastern empire till the invasion of the Saracens, who seized upon this country (A. D. 652). It was probably soon brought again under the dominion of the Greeks, and after another conquest in the tenth century remained in their possession till

* The Rhodians were rewarded by the Romans with a part of it (190): but they left it again (167): and the whole was reduced by Pompey as above mentioned.

the end of the eleventh century, when it was reduced by the Seljukian Turks (1074), who in the course of ten years made themselves masters of all Asia Minor. It has since undergone all the revolutions of that peninsula, as related in the preceding articles *.

RHODES.

This island is said to have been first peopled from Crete: the inhabitants were much engaged in trade and commerce, and had become very powerful by sea. Safe under the protection of some powerful neighbour, Rhodes enjoyed almost profound tranquillity till the time of Alexander the Great, to whom the Rhodians peaceably delivered up the island (B. C. 332); but, on his death (323), the inhabitants drove out the Macedonian garrison, and resumed their independence; which they preserved till the island was reduced by Vespasian to a Roman province (A.D. 71).

Rhodes remained under the dominion of the Romans till it was taken by the Saracens (642): who kept possession of it above two centuries and a half; at the end of which it was recovered by the Greek emperor Leo (900). The Venetians reduced it in 1124; but it was soon after recovered by John Vataces the emperor of Nice (1227).

Towards the beginning of the fourteenth century we find this island inhabited chiefly by Greeks, almost in a state of revolt, and by African corsairs: so that its dependence on the Eastern empire was very slight. In this situation it became an easy prey to the knights of St. John (1310) then residing in Cyprus; and who, soon afterwards, assumed the title of the Knights of Rhodes. For many years these knights con-

* In the fifteenth century the southern coast of Asia Minor appears to have been possessed by a few independent Turks who are styled Princes of Caramania.

tinued the terror of the Saracens and Turks. At length Soliman resolved to drive them from the island, and attacked the capital city with such an immense force, that the Grand Master of the Order surrendered the island to the conqueror (Dec. 22, 1522): and it has ever since remained in the hands of the Turks*.

CYPRUS.

This island was in ancient times divided amongst several petty kings; all of whom were rendered tributary or dependent by Cyrus king of Persia, about B. C. 560. It probably submitted to Alexander the Great; but, on the death of that monarch, the sovereignty of it was warmly contested. After the battle of Ipsus (301) it remained with Demetrius: but it was afterwards seized by Ptolemy (296); and remained subject to Egypt till Ptolemy Lathyrus at his death left it to his natural son (81). During the reign of this latter prince, the Romans most unjustly seized upon Cyprus (58) in consequence of the will of Alexander II king of Egypt, to whom the island never belonged.

It continued under the dominion of the Roman and Eastern empire till it was conquered by the Saracens (A.D. 648); from whom it was afterwards recovered by the emperor Constantine VIII (957). Isaac Comnenus threw off his allegiance to the empire in 1182; from whom it was conquered by Richard I king of England, who gave it to Guy of Lusignan king of Jerusalem (1192); in whose family it remained till the death of James (1475). Soon after this event, his widow Catherine ceded it to the Venetians; retaining however the title till her death. It was taken by the Turks in 1571; and has ever since remained in their possession.

* After quitting Rhodes, the Order fled to Viterbo in Italy; and remained there till 1530: when the emperor Charles V ceded to them the island of Malta, and the city of Tripoli in Africa: whence they assumed the name of the Knights of Malta.

EGYPT.

This kingdom, which is one of the oldest in the world of which we have any records, was originally of small extent. It consisted of a narrow tract of land on the banks of the Nile; the region, which was afterwards called Lower Egypt and the Delta, being in those early days a gulf of the sea. The date of the population of Egypt is uncertain: the first mortal king however who reigned over them is universally allowed to be Menes: and, from his time to the reign of Mœris, the Egyptian chronology is filled with a list of three hundred and thirty kings, who reigned altogether fourteen hundred years; but we have no records of their transactions. About the seventh century before Christ, the country appears to have been divided into twelve parts; over each of which some one of the principal nobility presided. Psammetichus, one of the twelve, dethroned all the rest and assumed the sovereignty himself (B.C. 670).

The history now begins to be divested of fable; and, from this time, may be reckoned equally certain with that of any other nation. Nechus, or Pharaoh Necho, the son and successor of Psammetichus, is often mentioned in the sacred writings. The country was afterwards reduced by Cambyses, king of Persia (525), but the Egyptians recovered their independence under Amyrtæus (414). Egypt was, a second time, brought under the dominion of the Persians by Darius Ochus (350); to which it continued annexed till Alexander the Great, after having subverted that monarchy, was received by the Egyptians with open arms, as their deliverer from Persian tyranny (332).

On the death of Alexander, Egypt was assigned to Ptolemy Lagus, alias Soter; who resided here as governor of these provinces, in trust for the children of Alexander. In the very first year of his government he made himself master of Cyrene:

and in the following year (322) he seized on Cœlo-Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine; it was not however till after the decisive battle of Ipsus (301) that he was confirmed in the possession of these dominions. His son Ptolemy Philadelphus seized upon Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia, and Caria (264). It was during this reign that the celebrated Greek translation of the Bible (called the *Septuagint*) was accomplished. After the death of Ptolemy Euergetes (221) the empire of Egypt was governed by a race of weak and vicious monarchs, and from this period began very sensibly to decline. Antiochus the Great, taking advantage of these circumstances, invaded Cœlo-Syria and Palestine (203), and united those provinces once more to the Syrian empire. In the reign of Philometer, the Romans compelled him to give up the possession of Libya and Cyrene to his brother Physcon (167): and on the death of Philometer (145) Physcon succeeded to the whole. Physcon at his death (116) left Cyrene to a natural son: and Lathyrus at his death (81) bequeathed the island of Cyprus to a natural son also. Alexander died a few years after in exile (59), leaving his kingdom by will to the Romans; who accepted a tribute of six thousand talents from Auletes as a renunciation of their right. On the death of Auletes (51) a dispute arose, about the succession, between Ptolemy Dionysius and Cleopatra; but, by the assistance of Cæsar, Cleopatra was triumphant. After Cæsar's death Cleopatra sided with Marc Anthony. The battle of Actium, however, decided the fate of both: for Egypt then submitted to Octavius (30), and was by him reduced to a Roman province.

It remained in possession of the Roman emperors, and their successors on the throne of Constantinople, till it was conquered by the Saracens under Amrou, one of the generals of the caliph Omar (A.D. 640). It continued under their dominion till the power of the Caliphs declined; when Ahmed Ebn Tolun rebelled against his sovereign, and founded the dynasty of the Tolunîds in this country (868): but it was again reduced by the caliph Al Moctafi (905). About

thirty years after, we find it again independent under Abu Beer Mohammed, surnamed Al Ikshîd (934); who also possessed the contiguous province of Syria: but his government was destroyed by Moez Ledinillah, the Fatemite caliph of Kairwân (969).

The Fatemite dynasty had been founded in Africa, by Obeidallah Al Mahadi, on the ruin of two different dynasties; viz. the Algabites in Libya and the Edrisites in Mauritania. The fourth caliph of this dynasty was the celebrated Moez Ledinillah above mentioned; who, after the reduction of Egypt and Syria, built the city of Al Kahira (or Grand Cairo) and made it the capital of his empire. The last prince of the Fatemite dynasty was Adhed Ledinillah; during whose reign the administration of affairs was altogether in the hands of the vizir. It was in this capacity that the celebrated Saladîn acted: and who, on the decease of Adhed, seized the country nominally for his master, Noureddîn the sultan of Aleppo; but in reality for himself, since Noureddîn did not live to enjoy it. On the death of Noureddîn (1174) he seized also on the dominions of that prince in Syria; and, by his valour, prudence, and humanity, maintained their independence and enlarged their boundaries. Saladîn was the son of Ayub; whence his successors on the throne of Egypt are styled Ayubites, or Ajubites.

About the middle of the thirteenth century the Mamelukes, or Mamlûks, a tribe of mercenary soldiers in the pay of the sultan, assumed the privilege and retained the power of dethroning the monarch at pleasure. They first deposed Malek-el-moadham (1250); and afterwards chose the sovereigns from their own body. The most celebrated of these was the sultan Bibars (1260), whose victorious arms drove the Christians out of Palestine, and reduced the kingdom of Jerusalem to the contracted limits of the city of Acre (1268). The sultan Selim I reduced this country under the dominion of the Turks (1517); and it has ever since acknowledged a dependence on the Porte. But this dependence has, of late

years, been more nominal than otherwise. since the real government of the country is still in the hands of the Mamelukes.

CYRENAICA.

This country is said to have been first settled by Battus the Theræan (B.C. 631); and soon rose to be a considerable state amongst the surrounding nations. Cyrenaica contained the *five* following cities; Cyrene, Berenice, Arsinoë, Ptolemaïs, and Apollonia: whence it was called the African Pentapolis; and as the first was the capital of the country, it gave name to the whole. It was probably either taken by Cambyses king of Persia (525) or rendered dependent on that power, and followed the fate of Egypt. On the death of Alexander the Great, when Ptolemy Lagus was intrusted with the government of Egypt, he took advantage of the dissentions which reigned amongst these cities, and soon reduced the country to his dominion (323). It remained upwards of two centuries an appendage to the Greek kingdom in Egypt. But Ptolemy Physcon, at his death (116), left this country to his natural son Ptolemy Apion; who, at his decease (97), left it by will to the Romans. The senate at first refused to accept it; and permitted all the cities to be governed by their own laws; which produced so much contention and confusion that it was reduced by them to the form of a province (76). It remained annexed to the Roman empire, till the Saracens conquered it (A. D. 640): when it underwent all the revolutions of their possessions in Africa; as related in the preceding article: and the Turks still hold a nominal jurisdiction over it.

TUNIS AND TRIPOLI.

THE country which is now known by the name of Tunis, was anciently called Africa Propria; and was the seat of the *Carthaginian Empire,* which in process of time extended over both provinces. The city of Carthage was founded by Elisa or Dido (B. C. 890), who is said to have fled from the cruelty and avarice of her brother Pygmalion king of Tyre. Her colony soon became populous and flourishing: but there is a chasm in the history of this country for three hundred years, as the records were all destroyed by the Romans. The Carthaginians applied themselves particularly to maritime affairs; and soon became very powerful by sea. They had colonies in Spain and in Sicily; as already related in the history of those states; and their connections in these two countries involved them in a series of disputes with the Romans, which eventually led to the destruction of their own empire. In the third and last Punic war, Carthage was destroyed (146), and the walls rased to the ground; the other cities, confederated with it, were dismantled; and the whole country reduced to a Roman province.

It continued subject to the Roman and Eastern empire, till Count Boniface, the rebellious governor, invited the Vandals from Spain under the celebrated Genseric; who made themselves masters of several places, and resolved to maintain their position (A. D. 429). Genseric afterwards seized upon Carthage (439); and, being a strenuous Arian, carried on a violent persecution against the Catholics in Africa. Five Vandal kings reigned in Africa: the last of these was Gelimer. In his reign, Belisarius, the celebrated general of Justinian, invaded Africa, and united these provinces again to the Eastern empire (534). It remained subject to that empire till the Saracens extended their conquests into this country (665); when it was gradually brought under the dominion of the Caliphs. The reduction of Carthage by Has-

san, governor of Egypt, completed the conquest of this part of Africa (698). In the year 800 Ibrahim Ebn Aglab was appointed to the government of Africa, by the caliph Haroun Al Rashîd. This governor found means to make himself independent; and thus founded the dynasty of the Aglabites, whose dominion extended from the confines of Egypt to Numidia. This dynasty gave way to that of the Fatemites (or Fâtmites); which was founded by Obeidallah (908). This monarch pretended to be descended from Ali and Fatima; and was proclaimed sovereign of Africa, under the title of Al Mohdi. The fourth prince of this dynasty was the celebrated Moez Ledinillah (953); who, having subdued Egypt (969), built the city of Al Kahira, or Cairo, and made it the metropolis of his empire. He assumed the title of Caliph, in opposition to his spiritual rival at Bagdad: and a schism was thus formed between these two sects of Mohammedans.

After the removal of the seat of empire, the western provinces soon fell to decay; and Yousuf, the son of Zeiri, founded the dynasty of the Zeirids in this country (970); whose dominion was afterwards extended to the most western parts of Africa (979). These were in their turn supplanted by the Almoheds (1148). On the extinction of that dynasty (1269), the Abuhâfs, who had been rising to some consequence in this part of Africa *, made themselves masters of the best part of their dominions. But the history of such internal disputes, in a country so degraded in the scale of nations as Africa, can afford little pleasure or instruction at the present day. It will therefore be sufficient to observe that the Spaniards seized upon Tripoli in 1505, and held it till they were driven out by Dragut the famous Turkish pirate (1541). Tunis surrendered to the Turks in 1570: but the inhabitants soon after got leave to elect their own bey or governor (1590); so that their dependence is now little more than nominal.

* Abu Zakeria, their first prince, was made sovereign of Tunis about 1240: but the family had been established from the year 1206.

ALGIERS.

This country is in a great measure the ancient kingdom of Numidia, in which some colonies of Phœnicians settled about the year B. C. 1200. The transactions of Numidia, during the earliest centuries, have long been buried in oblivion. The exploits of Jugurtha have been immortalized by the elegant pen of Sallust. He deposed his uncle Micipsa the lawful monarch; and seized the sovereignty himself. This involved him in a war with the Romans, in the course of which Jugurtha was taken prisoner (105). Numidia was then divided into three parts: one of which was annexed to the Roman province of Africa Propria; and the other two parts were erected into two separate kingdoms. One of these was given to Hiempsal, and the other to Mandrestal; both descendants of Masinissa. The latter kingdom was however reduced by Pompey, and united to the former (81). In the civil war between Cæsar and Pompey, Juba (the reigning prince and successor to Hiempsal) sided with the latter: but Cæsar defeated him at Thapsus, and reduced Numidia to a Roman province (46).

After this it underwent all the revolutions related in the preceding article, till the Saracens invaded it; and who, after the reduction of Carthage (A. D. 698), soon effected the conquest of the western provinces of Africa (709). Towards the beginning of the tenth century, the dominion of the Caliphs was overturned, and the dynasty of the Fatemites was established (908). On the removal of their seat of government to Egypt, the western provinces fell into other hands; and underwent the revolutions related in the preceding article, till it was invaded by the Spaniards (1505), who reduced several considerable places. The Spaniards were driven out by Barbarossa, who seized on the country and was crowned king of Algiers (1516). His successor, in order to secure it to his posterity, put it under the protection of the Grand Seignior

(1535); from which period it has since been considered as dependent on the Turks. But this dependence is merely nominal.

MOROCCO.

This country was the ancient Mauritania. We find nothing worth relating concerning it prior to the Christian æra; except that Bogud, one of its kings, assisted Julius Cæsar, and contributed greatly to his success in Africa. This monarch was deposed by Bocchus; on whose death (A.D.50) Mauritania was reduced to a Roman province. After this, it underwent all the revolutions of that empire as already related in the two preceding articles. When the Saracens pushed their conquests into the western provinces of Africa (698), this country in a few years submitted to their dominion (709), and formed the boundary of their empire. But the power of the Caliphs soon declined; and the dynasty of the Edrisites supplanted their authority. This race of princes was driven out by the Fatemites (919): and, on the removal of the seat of government to Egypt, their power also went to decay in these parts; and was succeeded by that of the Zeirids.

In 1056 a new spiritual dynasty was founded in this part of Africa by Abu Texifin, a pretended saint; who with a number of followers, called Morabites (Al Marabûts), soon reduced all the western parts of Africa, and thereby established the dynasty of the Almoravids. His son Yusef invaded Spain, and brought great part of that kingdom under his subjection (1091). This dynasty was overturned by the Almoheds (Al Moahhedîn, or Al Mohâds), another religious sect which sprang up about the beginning of the twelfth century (1120), and so called from Al Mohedi their founder. Abdolmumen, one of this race, drove out Brahem, the last of the Almoravids, and was declared sovereign in his stead (1146).

He extended his dominion into Spain; which was ably maintained by his successors. But Mohammed Al Naker met with a signal defeat on the plains of Tolosa (1212), which led to the downfall of his family. The dynasty was entirely extinct in 1269.

Prior to that event the Benemerini seized this country*: but for near three centuries its history is uninteresting to the general reader. Towards the end of this period, another pretended saint, named Hassen, laid the foundation of a new government†. He asserted that he was of the race of the Sharîfs, a title affected by the descendants of Mohammed. By the most refined arts he forwarded the grand object which he had in view. His son Hammed seized upon Morocco, and was proclaimed king (1529): whilst Mohammed, another of his sons, made himself master of several other places, and assumed also the regal title. For many years the empire was divided by the rival claims of the different branches of this house: but in process of time they became united under one chief; whose successors now hold Morocco and Fez, with the title of emperor.

CANADA.

The vast *continent*‡ of America was first discovered by Sebastian Cabot, a Venetian adventurer in the service of Henry VII king of England, towards the latter end of June, in the year 1497. But, although the English monarch did

* In the year 1213. Their proper title is Benou Merin, or the children of Merin, who was the founder of the dynasty. They were succeeded by the Oatazes, or Watâs, in the year 1360.

† About the year 1500.

‡ Columbus, to whom we are undoubtedly indebted for a knowledge of the New World, commenced his first voyage Aug. 3, 1492. In his third voyage, he first descried the continent of South America, near the island of Trinidad (Aug. 1498).

not think proper to make any use of this discovery, the French quickly attempted it. In 1525 it is said that John Verazan took possession of Canada in the name of the king of France. The French afterwards made several attempts to settle there; particularly in the years 1534 and 1598. It was not however till the year 1608 that the colony was fully established. This was accomplished by founding the city of Quebec; which, from that time, became the capital of all the settlements in Canada. Nevertheless, the colony continued, for many years, in a very bad way; and was often in danger of being exterminated by the Indians. They at length concluded a permanent peace with the natives; and so far ingratiated themselves with them, that they induced them to become their allies in their subsequent contests with the English.

In order to unite and secure their possessions in Canada and Louisiana, the French established a chain of forts along the banks of the river Ohio: which the English considered as an unjust usurpation, and an indirect attack upon their own settlements; and which was the cause of a war between the two countries (1756). An expedition, under the command of general Amherst, was sent out against this province: and the battle of Quebec (Sept. 13, 1759), where the immortal Wolfe closed his victorious career, soon brought the whole of Canada under the dominion of Great Britain; in whose possession it still remains.

NOVA SCOTIA.

The first grant of lands, in this country, was bestowed by James I on his secretary sir William Alexander (1622), who gave it the name of Nova Scotia or New Scotland. Since that period it has frequently changed masters; being sometimes in possession of the French, and sometimes in that of the English. Charles I ceded this country, by treaty, to the French (1632); thereby bestowing, as his own, a right which

had been already vested in the British adventurers. At the close of the civil war, Cromwell took upon himself the cognisance of this affair; and determined to redress the injury done to the settlers. An expedition was sent out under the command of major Sedgwick, who reduced the whole country (1654), and obliged the French to submit at discretion. It was again ceded by Charles II (1662) to the French; who proved such troublesome neighbours to the English, that it was once more reduced under their dominion (1690). It was however given up again by the peace of Ryswick (1697): but was finally reduced by the British in 1710; and their conquest was confirmed by the treaty of Utrecht.

UNITED STATES.

THE vast tract of country, which forms the present republic of the United States of America, has (since the discovery of the New World) been peopled and cultivated by colonies principally from England; who established different forms of government in the several provinces, according to the object and views of the original settlers who migrated thither. *New England* was formerly called North Virginia; and an attempt was made to settle here about the year 1614. Shortly after this, many dissenters, with a view to avoid the intolerant and persecuting spirit of the Church of England, fled to this country as to an asylum; and, by degrees, established colonies in different parts. New England was divided into four states *; which, at first, had no connection with one another. The necessity of maintaining an armed force against the Indians obliged them to form a confederacy (1643), which subsisted many years.

Pennsylvania derived its name from the famous quaker

* *New Hampshire, Massachuset's Bay, Rhode Island,* and *Connecticut:* to which has been since added the state of *Vermont.*

William Penn, who, having obtained a grant of it from king Charles II, began to settle here about the year 1681. Not satisfied, however, with the title granted him by the crown, Mr. Penn bought the lands also of the Indians for a valuable consideration; paying them in cloth, tools, and various utensils, to their entire satisfaction. *New York* was first attempted to be settled by Mr. Hudson, an Englishman; but the Dutch, having purchased his interest, began to settle here (1608). Charles II, however, not admitting that the Dutch had any right to the sovereignty of countries first discovered by a subject of England, reduced it under his own dominion (1664), and immediately granted it to his brother James, duke of York; whence its name*.

Virginia is so called from the circumstance of its having been first discovered and visited during the reign of queen Elizabeth (1584): but, although several attempts were immediately made to settle the country, it was not till the year 1607 that a colony was established here. *Maryland* derives its name from Henrietta Maria, the consort of Charles I, who made a grant of this country, with very extraordinary powers, to lord Baltimore. It was principally settled by Roman Catholics (1633), many of whom were persons of very considerable consequence.

Carolina was first discovered by the English; but, they neglecting to settle it, a colony of French protestants was transported hither; who named the first place of their settlement Arx Carolina, in honour of their prince Charles IX. In a short time, however, that colony was destroyed by the Spaniards; and no other attempt was made by any European power to settle here, till the English took possession of the country in the reign of Charles II. That monarch granted Carolina to certain noblemen and gentlemen (1670): and a plan of government for this new colony was drawn up by the

* *New Jersey*, which was part of this grant, the duke sold to lord Berkeley and sir George Carteret. The state of *Delaware* also was afterwards alienated in a similar manner.

celebrated LOCKE, who very wisely proposed an universal toleration in all matters relative to religion. This country was afterwards divided into two distinct states, each under its separate government and laws (1728): whence the appellations of *North* and *South Carolina*. The settlement of *Georgia* was projected in 1732; when several public-spirited noblemen and others, out of compassion to the poor and as a further security to Carolina, subscribed a considerable sum to provide necessaries for such persons as were willing to transport themselves to this country in order to cultivate and settle it. They obtained letters patent from his majesty George II, in honour of whom the province was called Georgia.

These various colonies had to contend, in the infancy of their settlement, with considerable difficulties and dangers, but they afterwards rose to a great degree of prosperity, power, and opulence. Several odious and arbitrary acts of interference, on the part of Great Britain, in the local government and general commerce and concerns of the American provinces, estranged the affection of the colonies from the mother country, and produced a Revolution which has been attended with the most important consequences not only in America, but also in the general affairs of Europe. The Americans, exasperated by the proceedings of the British parliament, formally renounced all connection with Great Britain; and published their celebrated Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776); which destroyed all hopes of reconciliation, and left every thing to the decision of the sword. Their independence has since been formally acknowledged by Great Britain and by all the powers of Europe. Since that period, this country has undergone no other internal revolution, than the admission of new states * to the confederacy in proportion to the population of the country: and the acquisition of Louisiana, which was ceded to the Americans by the French in 1803.

* The states of *Kentuckey, Tenassee, North Western Territory*, &c. are amongst the number thus admitted.

LOUISIANA.

This province is said to have been first discovered by the French under La Sale (1683): and some few years afterwards D'Iberville sailed up the Mississippi river (1699). The country about this period began to be settled; although the title of discovery was often claimed likewise by the Spaniards and the English. In 1717 the regent of France erected a new company of commerce, called the Mississippi Company; the plan of which was projected by the celebrated Mr. Law: and which, being founded upon principles similar to that of the South Sea Scheme, terminated likewise in an equally disastrous and unfortunate manner. Louisiana situated on the west of the Mississippi, together with New Orleans, was ceded to the Spaniards by a secret convention (Nov. 3,1762). They have lately given up the sovereignty of it again to the French; who almost immediately ceded it to the United States of America (April 30, 1803), in whose possession it now remains.

FLORIDA.

This country was discovered by Juan Ponce de Leon, an able Spanish navigator (1512); who undertook his voyage with the romantic and singular design of searching for a fountain, whose waters were said to have the property of restoring youth to all old persons who tasted them. The Spaniards, soon afterwards, attempted to settle it; but, violent disputes were carried on between them and the French; and it cannot be said to have been entirely subdued till the year 1539. The Spaniards possessed it till the year 1763; when it was ceded by treaty to Great Britain. But, during the American war it was again reduced by the Spaniards; and was ceded to them by the subsequent treaty of peace (1783).

MEXICO.

Mexico, the most powerful and civilized kingdom in the New World, was first discovered (though imperfectly) by a Spaniard, named Nunez de Balboa; but in the year 1518 the conquest of it was undertaken by the celebrated adventurer Ferdinando Cortes. He set sail from the Havannah (Feb. 10, 1519) with only six hundred and seventeen men; out of which there were but thirteen who were armed with muskets, thirty-two were cross-bow men, and the rest had swords and spears. With this slender and ill-provided train did Cortes attempt to reduce an empire more extensive than the whole Spanish monarchy. Having landed his troops on the continent, he proceeded to the city of Mexico, where he had an interview with Montezuma, the emperor. The Mexican empire, at this period, was at a pitch of grandeur to which no society ever attained in so short a period. Though it had subsisted, according to their own traditions, only a hundred and thirty years, its dominion extended from the north to the south sea, over territories stretching, with some small interruption, above five hundred leagues from east to west, and more than two hundred from north to south; comprehending provinces not inferior in fertility, population, and opulence, to any in the torrid zone. The people were warlike and enterprising; the authority of the monarch unbounded; and his revenues considerable. Montezuma received the Spaniards with apparent kindness and friendship; but Cortes, at length, growing suspicious of his intentions, seized upon his person and carried him off to the Spanish quarters. He was afterwards slain by his own subjects in a conflict between the two powers (1520). Several desperate battles immediately followed this event: but though the Mexicans were occasionally successful, and bravely defended themselves to the last, yet on the capture of the city (Aug. 13, 1521) the whole empire may be said to have fallen into the hands of the Spaniards: in whose possession it still remains.

PERU AND CHILI.

WHEN the Spaniards seized upon Darien they were informed of an opulent and extensive empire which existed towards the south-east; and which afterwards proved to be the kingdom of *Peru*. Three adventurers formed the bold and (at that time) chimerical design of subjugating this country: their names were Francisco Pizarro, Diego de Almagro, and Hernando Luque. Having with great difficulty collected together a body of troops, consisting of only one hundred and sixty-four men (thirty-six of whom were horsemen, twenty were armed with cross-bows, and three with muskets), they ventured to invade the country in a hostile manner (1531). Unfortunately for the Peruvians, a civil war at that time raged in the country respecting the succession to the throne. Pizarro took advantage of this circumstance; and, having forcibly and treacherously seized the Inca, or sovereign of Peru (1532), cruelly and perfidiously put him to death. The inhabitants, after this event, submitted to the Spaniards without much further opposition.

Chili was first invaded by Almagro, the companion of Francisco Pizarro (1535); who with a body of five hundred and seventy men attempted the conquest of this country. The ignorant inhabitants imagined that they were deputies from the god Virachoca; and immediately collected for them an immense offering of gold and silver, which only served to excite the avarice of the Spaniards. Almagro, however, was recalled to the assistance of his countrymen in Peru (1538); and thus abandoned the advantages he had gained. But, soon after, the project was re-assumed by Pedro de Valdivia (1540): who, notwithstanding the fortitude of the natives in defending their possessions (for they now began to form more correct notions of their invaders), made such progress in the conquest of the country, that he founded the city of St. Jago; and thus gave a beginning to the establishment of the Spanish dominion in that province.

BRAZIL.

The coast of Brazil was accidentally discovered by Alvarez Cabral, a Portuguese navigator (April 24, 1500); who, in a voyage to the East Indies, stood out to sea and kept so far to the west, that to his surprise he found himself upon an unknown coast. Thus it appears that if the sagacity of Columbus had not conducted mankind to America, this fortunate accident might have led them, a few years later, to the knowledge of that extensive continent. The Portuguese did not attempt to settle this country for nearly half a century afterwards, when they founded the city of St. Salvador (1549). They met with some interruption at first from the Spaniards, who considered the whole continent of South America as belonging to them: but it was at length agreed that the Portuguese should possess all the country lying between the two rivers Amazon and La Plata.

When the crown of Portugal came into the possession of the Spaniards (1580), this country also experienced the fate of the mother country. And, soon after the Dutch threw off the yoke of Spain, they attacked the Spanish colonies both in the east and west, and reduced a very considerable portion of the country (1630); and they would probably have soon reduced the whole colony had not the revolution in Portugal infused fresh spirits into the inhabitants, and enabled them eventually to drive out those intruders (1654).

When the French invaded Portugal, under general Junot, and threatened to overrun the whole country, the royal family, rather than submit to the conqueror, formed the resolution of retiring, with the whole court, to Brazil. Accordingly on the 29th of November, 1807, the prince regent and his family, accompanied by most of his ships of war and many of his adherents, departed from Lisbon, under the protection of a British squadron, and arrived at Rio-Janeiro early in the ensuing year. This country, under a wise and equitable govern-

ment, is capable of being rendered very powerful and opulent; and of producing a considerable effect and influence on the grand revolutions that are taking place in this quarter of the world.

GUIANA.

Very little is known of the interior state of this country; for, the possessions of the Europeans are confined principally to the sea-coasts. It was formerly divided between the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the French. That part which belongs to the Portuguese is in a great measure involved in the preceding article. The English at one time possessed part of the coast, but they were driven out by the Dutch (1663), and their conquests were confirmed by the treaty of Breda. The French have had settlements here ever since the year 1635. In consequence of the singular revolutions that have lately taken place in Europe, this country, from the river Amazon to the isthmus of Darien, is in a very unsettled state; and is probably destined very shortly to experience some very material alteration in its government.

REMARKS

ON

DR. PRIESTLEY'S CHART.

HAVING thus explained the nature and design of the present Chart, I shall proceed to make some comments on a similar work, which was published many years ago by Dr. PRIESTLEY; and which has been blindly praised and recommended by most succeeding writers on this subject. The plan and design of Dr. Priestley's *Chart of History* were certainly excellent; but the execution of it has been miserably performed. The arrangement of the countries on his chart is liable to many objections; and the careless and hasty manner in which it has been drawn up renders it totally unfit for the purposes of *information*. Moreover, the Description which accompanies it abounds with such gross errors, misrepresentations, and omissions, as show neither the accuracy of the author, nor a regard for his literary character. *Some* of these faults I shall now proceed to point out; in order, not only that the reader may see, more in detail, the nature of the charges which I have here adduced, but likewise be convinced of their truth and justness.

In the very first page of his book, the author begins his account with *Norway*, in the following words: "The peninsula which contains Norway and Sweden was the Scandinavia of the ancients. This part of it had kings of its own till 1375; when Margaret, daughter of Valdemar, *the third king of Denmark*, having been queen of Norway, in consequence of a marriage into the royal family, and having also succeeded to the crown of Denmark upon the death of her *father*, both the crowns were united. *Upon her death*, her

" *son* Eric was *elected* king of both countries, and they have " continued under one hand ever since."

This is the whole that is said of that once independent kingdom: and nothing will more fully justify the censure which I have cast upon Dr. Priestley's work, than the bare exposure of the singular and gross errors with which this short account abounds; and with which the author commences his Epitome. In the first place, Margaret did not succeed either to the crown of Denmark or Norway till the year 1387, instead of 1375: and it was then in consequence of the death of her *son* Olaus, and not on account of the decease of her *father**. Secondly; Eric, who succeeded Margaret, was not her *son*, but her *grand-nephew*: that is, he was the *grandson* of her *sister* Ingeburga. Moreover, he had not only been elected (or rather *declared*) as her successor, but had absolutely been crowned as such, above fifteen years *before* her death. Lastly, this Valdemar, *the third king of Denmark*, should have been described as Valdemar III, king of Denmark. A typographical error of this kind might easily steal into any publication unobserved: but it is singular that it should have been perpetuated through every succeeding edition. Joined with the other facts above mentioned, it cannot give us any favourable idea of the accuracy of the author; and, as he was writing for the instruction of youth (who could not so readily detect him) he ought to have been more circumspect and careful.

In his history of *Sweden*, he says, " We have no certain " accounts of this country till 714, when it was converted to " Christianity by Ansgarius, a monk, in the reign of Biorno III." Now this monarch did not begin to reign till the year 831; so that there must be an error of upwards of a century in this date†. Again, he observes that " in 1411, Eric, duke of Pome-

* Haquin, king of Norway, and the husband of Margaret, did not die till the year 1380: his son Olaus, who had been some time king of Denmark, then succeeded him in his dominions: and it was not till the decease of Olaus in 1387 that his mother inherited the two kingdoms.

† Ansgarius was sent thither by the emperor Louis, son of Charlemagne.

"rania, succeeded to all the three kingdoms, and Sweden re-
"mained subject to Denmark *till* 1523." But in this interval it had assumed and maintained its *independence* no less than *three different times:* viz. from 1448 to 1457; from 1464 to 1497; and from 1502 to 1520.

In the account of *Russia* he says, "About 1200 Muscovy "was invaded by Batu, khan of the Mungles, about the same "time that these conquerors subdued the Tartars of Kipjak. "The Mungles held it in subjection till the empire of Jenghis "Khan broke in pieces, when the Kipjaks, who held the coun-"try bordering upon Russia, became independent; and in "1540 John Basilowits threw off the yoke of the Kipjaks." The reader perhaps will hardly conceive, from this statement, that Batû himself, after conquering the Kipjâk country, became the head of that nation known in history by the name of the Kipjâk Tatars; and who, according to this curious account, are said to have thrown off their own yoke. Batû invaded Russia in 1237, and not in 1200; and he held his sovereignty *independent* of the successors of Zinghis Khân. Towards the commencement of the fifteenth century, his empire began to show symptoms of decay, and soon after fell to pieces; and the very name of Kipjâk was thus blotted from the page of history, just at the time when Dr. Priestley dates its revival*. John Basilowitz threw off the yoke of this expiring monarchy in the year 1477, and not in 1540, as he died in 1505. These are not *errors of the press;* since they are indelibly and permanently *engraven on the chart.*

In the account of *France* he has shown the grossest ignorance of some of the most prominent features of the Roman History: for he makes an interval of *ten years* between the conquest of the Helvetii by Julius Cæsar, and the conquest of the Gauls†; when it is well known that the latter were re-

* About the middle of the fourteenth century this nation took the title of *Usbecs,* from the name of one of the khans.

† He says the Helvetii were conquered in 57 B.C.; and the Gauls in 47 B.C.

duced *within two years* after the former were subdued. A similar error occurs under the account both of Flanders and Holland; and they are all likewise perpetuated *on the chart*.

In the account of *Holland* (for I pass over many intermediate errors) he says, that the posterity of Thierry "enjoyed "it till 1206, when it passed to the earls of Hainault, in which "family it continued till 1417, *when* it passed, by the sur- "render of Jaqueline, *count* of Hainault and Holland, to Philip "the Good, duke of Burgundy." In the first place, this country did not pass to the earls of Hainault till the year 1299, instead of 1206. Secondly, Jaqueline, the *countess* of Hainault and Holland, *did not succeed* to her dominions till the year 1417; and it was in the year 1433 that she was constrained to surrender them to Philip. The Doctor has taken the *beginning* for the *end* of her reign.

In the account of *Venice* he says, that the Venetians "had "greatly distinguished themselves in the wars with the Turks, "*from whom* they took Candia." Now it happens unfortunately for the author that the very *reverse* of this was the fact; because the Turks took Candia from the Venetians. The Venetians did not forcibly *take* Candia at all: for, they *bought* it of the marquis of Montferrat.

In the account of *Hungary* he says, that the race of Toxis "continued till 1302, when Charles Martel, (son of Charles, "king of Naples, and of Mary, daughter of Stephen IV, king "of Hungary,) partly by *election*, and partly by *inheritance* "and *conquest*, succeeded to the crown." Whence the Doctor got this singular statement it is difficult to say. The fact is that Charles Martel died in 1295, seven years *before* the event above mentioned; and was neither *heir* to the crown, nor *elected* to fill the vacant throne: he did not even stir out of Italy to take possession of this (supposed) *conquered* country. It is true that in 1290 the Pope, by virtue of his disposing power, had *appointed* him king of Hungary; the states however would not recognise him, but (in defiance of the papal mandate) chose Andrew the Venetian. About ten years after

his death (that is, in the year 1310) they chose Charles Robert, the son of Charles Martel: so that Charles Martel is not even reckoned amongst the kings of Hungary.

In the account of *Germany* he says, "Upon the death of "Lewis the Mild this country was divided from France, *Lo-* "*tharius* being declared *Emperor of Germany*, and Charles "the Bald king of France." Now the fact is that Lothary was not emperor of *Germany*, neither had he any thing to do with that country. He was king of Italy, and *Emperor of the West:* but the latter was an empty title. His brother *Louis* had the dominion of Germany.

At the end of his account of *Naples*, he closes its history in the following laconic and confused manner: "In 1713 the "Two Sicilies, as they are now called, submitted to the *Im-* "*perialists*, and have *continued* in the *family of Spain* to this "day, but not annexed to the Spanish monarchy." By which it would seem that he meant to insinuate that the *Imperialists* and the *family of Spain* were one and the same party: but surely the author could not be so notoriously ignorant of the true state of the two nations. The fact was, that, by the peace of Utrecht in 1713, the Spanish monarch (who, for two centuries, had held possession of the Two Sicilies) was obliged to cede Naples to the house of Austria*, and the island of Sicily to the duke of Savoy. But the two countries were *again reduced by Spain* in 1735: and the sovereignty of those states has since been generally bestowed on some branch of the royal family, till the period of the late revolutions.

In the account of *Sicily*, the Vandals are said to have conquered the island in 439; and on the chart they are represented as having *retained* it till they were driven out by Belisarius in 535. Now, although the Vandals may have *invaded* that island about the period here mentioned, yet they did not make any *permanent* conquests there. It is true that they assisted in the reduction of it in 476; but they *ceded* it imme-

* The kingdom of Naples had been reduced by the Austrians in the year 1703.

diately to Odoacer king of the Heruli, and *it underwent the fate of Italy* till it was reduced by Belisarius. The Doctor likewise adds, "In 669 it was conquered by the Saracens, but "the Greeks soon recovered part of it, which they held till "1041, when both the Saracens and Greeks were expelled by "the Normans, under William Ferebatus. Roger I, *who suc-* "*ceeded this William*, was by the Pope made king of Si- "cily." What a series of errors is crowded into these few lines! The conquest of Sicily by the Saracens did not take place till the year 878; and it remained in their possession till the year 1072. It is true that the Normans, *in conjunction with the Greeks*, attempted to drive them out, in the year 1038; but the advantages which they gained were only *temporary*. They were eventually expelled by Roger (the youngest brother of William Ferebatus), who assumed the title of *count* of Sicily, and held his dominions *independent* of his brother. His son, Roger II, was the first who obtained the title of *King*, in the year 1130: but this prince was not the *successor* of William; for, the possessions of this latter nobleman were in *Italy*, and had *already* descended to *seven* successive heirs. It is true that Roger afterwards *seized upon* those territories: but the passage, above alluded to, certainly does not convey this meaning. The whole account concludes with the well known, malicious, accusation "that the Sicilian massacre "was perpetrated *by the order* of Peter III, king of Arra- "gon:" an assertion which would hardly have been expected from the pen of such a writer.

In the account of *Spain* it is stated that "Athaulfus, the "son of Alaric, was the *first* Goth who settled in Spain, being "*driven from Gaul* by other northern nations in 415." Now the *first* Gothic monarch who made any permanent conquests in Spain was Theodoric II in 456: but the seat of government was not transferred thither till 532. It is true that Athaulfus, or Adolphus, *attempted* the reduction of that country, but it was a *voluntary* enterprise on behalf of the Romans; and he was *not driven* from his possessions in Gaul:

but, on the contrary, was (for this assistance) *more fully confirmed in them.*

In the account of *Tunis*, that country is stated to have "continued a part of the Roman empire till 439, when it was "taken by Genseric the Vandal*, whose posterity possessed "it till 534, when it was recovered by Belisarius. In 644 the "Saracens conquered this, *together with the rest of the Afri-"can coast;* and in 910 Obeidallah Al Mohdi drove out the "reigning family, called the Aglabites, and founded the Fate-"mite dynasty residing at Cairwan in this district. In 952 "Al Moez *removed the seat of empire* from Cairwan into "Egypt." The greater part of this statement is incorrect. Genseric took possession of the country (all but the city of Carthage) in 429 instead of 439†. On the other hand, the Saracens did not *attempt* the reduction of *this* part of Africa till the year 665; and it was not finally conquered till the year 698. *The rest of the African coast* was not reduced till 709. Moreover, Al Moez did not conquer, nor attempt to conquer, the kingdom of Egypt till the year 969‡; and it was not (of course) till after the building of the new city of Al Kahira that *the seat of empire* was transferred: he did not even ascend the throne till the year 953.

In the account of *Louisiana* it is said that it "was disco-"vered by the French in 1633," and that "in 1718 they took "possession of it under de la Sale." In the first place, it was discovered in 1683 and not in 1633§: secondly, de la Sale

* In his account of *Spain* the Doctor says that "In 428 the Vandals "quitted Spain and went into Africa." So that we have two *different* dates assigned to the *same* event: and these different dates are likewise preserved on his chart.

† This is not an error of the press; as the same date is preserved on the chart.

‡ In his account of *Egypt*, the Doctor says that Al Moez conquered it in 970; so that here also we have two contradictory dates given. For, Al Moez could not *remove the seat of empire* thither, eighteen years *before* he subdued the country.

§ This is not an *error of the press* merely.

was murdered in an expedition to the Illinois country in 1687, or above thirty years before the period which Dr. Priestley mentions as the date of his arrival in Louisiana.

These are a *few* only of the innumerable errors with which Dr. Priestley's *Description* abounds. Were I to state them all, I must make an abstract of the *whole work*: for, I believe there is not a single page in which there are not *several* misrepresentations and mistakes, similar to those above mentioned. Added to these, the errors of the press, or of the author, with regard to the dates and names, are beyond conception greater than in any work of the same size I ever witnessed; and these are unfortunately varying in every edition, so that the reader is always at a loss to ascertain which is the most correct. For instance, the *date* of the conquest of Puglia and Sicily by the emperor Henry VI is in some editions stated to be 1194, in others as 1199; whilst some give 1192, and others (by an inversion of the figures) state it to be 1129. Similar instances occur in many other places*. It is the same with respect to the *names* of persons: for in the account of *Judæa*, we have *Senacherib* introduced as the king of Assyria who carried the Ten Tribes into captivity, instead of *Shalmaneser*: and in the account of *Spain*, the Saracens are said to have invaded that country, under the command of *Muza*, instead of *Tarik*. The sovereigns, likewise, that established themselves in *Egypt* and *Syria*, in 934, are universally called *Ashkedians*, instead of *Akhschidians*, or more properly *Ikshidites*.

In some places, no attention is paid to the *chronological* order of the events recorded. Thus, in the account of *France* it is stated that "in 1204 Philip Augustus took Normandy "from king John; *but* in 1154 Henry II became possessed "of Poictou, &c." Again, in the account of *Babylonia*, it is stated that "in 631 B.C. Asarhaddon king of Assyria seized "this territory; in 730 B.C. Nabonassar founded a kingdom "of Babylon." In *each* case here adduced, we are led (from

* The engraving of the dates, *on the chart*, prevents this liability to confusion.

the order of the narration) to suppose (contrary to the fact) that the *second* event was *subsequent* to the one *first* related: and such a loose and careless mode of narration is liable to mislead the reader.

Independent of these errors and mis-statements, the work itself is too abridged to serve even as an accompaniment to a view of general history; and is thus rendered inapplicable to the purposes for which it was intended. Many of the most important events in history are not so much as mentioned: no connection is kept up between the successive dynasties that have reigned over the several states; and many of them are even omitted: whereby the account becomes confused and unsatisfactory. Thus, in the account of *Syria* it is stated that the Saracens reduced it in 640: and that in 970 it was conquered by the Fatemites: but no notice is taken of the *intermediate* possessors of the country, the Tolunids and the Ikshidites *. We have likewise a history of *Florence* where the family of the Medici is not noticed: a history of *France* where the name of Charlemagne is not even mentioned: a history of *Hindostân* without the least account of the conquests of the English in that country: and a history of *Great Britain*, where only one event is recorded (the reduction of Wales) from the time of William the conqueror to the present period!!!

Hitherto my remarks have been confined to an exposure of the errors and defects of the *Description*: but, if we turn to the *Chart* itself, we shall find equal cause for animadversion. It is in many places improperly drawn up; is frequently at variance with the printed description; and sometimes presents a false idea of the power and extent of the different states. Thus, in the account of *Rhodes*, the date 156 B.C. is not correctly placed; and, in the account of *Messenia*, the date 369 B.C. is described by a *dotted* line, as if uncertain. *Frequent* errors of this kind are to be found. The representation of *Umbria*, on the Chart, does not agree, in any one

* Or Ashkedians, as they are strangely called by Dr. Priestley.

particular, with the account of that country as given in the Description. The same observation may be made with respect to the Seljuks of Kerman, under the history of *Persia*. The account of *Leautong* and that part of the history of *China* which relates to the Kitans, are also at variance, both in the Chart and in the Description. The kingdom of *Tremeçen* is likewise, in both those works, stated to belong to *Algiers*: whilst, in the history of *Morocco*, it is described as forming a part of that empire. *Palestine* and *Phœnicia* are moreover represented as belonging to the *Seleucidæ* from the time of Alexander's death: but it is well known that those countries remained for above a century without interruption in the hands of the *Ptolemies*. In the account of *Flanders*, the early part of its history is confined to the *province* so called: whilst the subsequent statement (both in the Description and in the Chart) appears to embrace the history of the *Netherlands* in general*. In the delineation of the history of *Spain*, on the chart, the power of the Suevi appears to be annihilated *at once* by the Goths in 584. But they had been confined, for upwards of a century, to the mountainous parts of Galicia; and had almost ceased to be a nation ever since the year 477, when the Goths had firmly established themselves in Spain, on the ruins of that monarchy. Similar remarks might be made in other places: for, in most cases we shall find that large conquests have been *progressive*†. These points of history can be represented *to the eye*, with very good effect, by means of the chart: and this quality is indeed one of its principal recommendations. We ought therefore to take advantage of it, wherever it can be done without confusion.

In the *colouring* of his chart, he has likewise shown a great

* In some editions of the Chart, the province of *Nova Scotia* is represented as belonging to the United States of America. This, together with several other errors, I pointed out to the author; and they were consequently corrected in the subsequent editions. But, I was not aware, at that time, of the defective state of the *whole work*.

† See what has been already said on this subject in page 21.

want of accuracy and discrimination. The different Mohammedan states, for instance, in Europe, Asia, and Africa, are all classed under the general denomination of Saracens; and, from their appearance on the chart, might be mistaken for *one* nation. But, it is well known that, in the ninth century, a great number of provinces were lost to the caliphs of Bagdad; and their empire was soon after reduced to very narrow limits. The Saracens in Spain and Africa long preserved their *independence;* and, having created Caliphs of their own, broke off all connection with those of Bagdad. A similar remark might be made upon several other dynasties, the *unity* of whose empire was frequently destroyed on the death of the principal conqueror, or some of his immediate successors; but, the several parts of which are strangely preserved, on the chart, under the same sovereignty, for a long period after such extinction.

I shall not, however, proceed further in this odious task of criticism. The comments, which I have here given, have been in a great measure called for, from the nature of the present work; and will (I think) warrant the strictures which I have made on Dr. Priestley's performance. They are, by no means, however, the *whole* which I could produce in support of my assertions; but, they are sufficient to show the great want of correctness in the author, and the necessity of a *new* work, on more just and accurate principles.

INDEX.

Abouhafs - - *Page* 162
Achaia - - - 113
Ac Koyunlu - - 148
Ætolia - - 102
Aglabites - - 162
Albania - - - 101
Alemanni - - 45
Algiers - - 163
Almohedes - - 164
Almoravids - - 164
Alsace - - - 55
Anjou, county - 62
——, house of - 91
Aquitain - - 59
Arabia - - 128
Arles - - 70
Armenia Major - 146
——— Minor - - 148
Armorican States - 57
Arragon - - 97
Assyria - - 135
Atâbeys - - 141
Athens - - - 109
Attica - - 109
Avars - - - 43
Ayubites - - 159
Babylonia - - 137
Bactria - - 122
Batânists - - 137
Benemirini - - 165
Beneventum - 90
Bernicia - - 25
Bithynia - - 150
Bœotia - - 109
Bohemia - *Page* 42
Bosporus - - 37
Bowids - - - 133
Brabant - 50
Brazil - - 173
Buccharia - - 122
Bulgaria - - 100
Burgundi - - 56
Burgundy, county - 64
——— duchy 51 & 64
——— kingdom - 70
Caliphs of Bagdad - 128
——— Cordova - 95
Canada - - 165
Candahar - - 127
Candia - - 114
Cappadocia - - 150
Capua - - 91
Caramania - - 155
Caria - - 152
Carolina - - - 168
Carthage - - 161
Castile - - 96
Chili - - - 172
China - - 116
Cilicia - - - 154
Constantinopolitan empire 103
Cordova - - 95
Cossacs - - 38
Crete - - 114
Crim Tatary - - 37
Cyprus - - 156
Cyrenaica - - 160
Dalmatia - - 99

Dauphiné - Page 63
Deira - - 25
Delamites - - 132
Denmark - 29
Edrisites - - 164
Egypt - - 157
England - - 24
Epirus - - 101
Esthonia - - 34
Fatemites - - 162
Ferrara - - 83
Finland - - 33
Flanders - - 50
Florence - - 82
Florida - - 170
France - - 56
Franche Comté - 64
Franks - - 57
Friesland - - 49
Friuli - - 78
Gasnevids - - 122
Gauls - - 56
Genoa - - 73
Georgia - - 169
Gepidæ - - 43
Germany - - 44
Granada - - 98
Guelders - - 49
Guiana - - 174
Hainault - - 50
Helvetii - - - 70
Heruli - - 68
Hindostân - - 125
Holland - - 52
Hungary - - 43
Huns - - 43
Hya - - - 120
Ikshedites - - 159
Ilkhanians - - 139
Illyricum - Page 99
Ireland - - 22
Israel - - 144
Jerusalem - - 146
Judah - - 144
Kara Koyunlu - 148
Karasmians - - 123
Kipjâk - - 35
Korasân - - 129
Korea - - 115
Laconia - - 111
Latium - - 84
Leon - - - 96
Lingones - - 83
Lithuania - - 39
Livonia - - 33
Lombards - - 78
Lorrain - - 54
Louisiana - - 170
Luxemburg - - 51
Lyau-tong - - 115
Lycia - - 154
Lydia - - 152
Macedon - - 106
Maine - - 62
Mamelukes - - 159
Mantchew Tatary - 116
Mantua - - 77
Maryland - - 168
Mauritania - - 164
Media - - 135
Messenia - - 111
Metz - - 58
Mexico - - 171
Milan - - 78
Modena - - 76
Mœsia - - 100
Moguls - - 119
——— in India - 127

Mongolia - *Page* 119
Montferrat - - 77
Moors - - - 95
Morea - - 114
Morocco - - 164
Mysia - - 152
Naples - - 90
Navarre - - 97
Netherlands - - 48
New England - 167
New York - - 168
Normandy - - 61
Normans in Sicily - - 91
Norway - - 30
Nova Scotia - - 166
Numidia - - 163
Nyu-tche Tatars - 116
Onigars - - 44
Ostrogoths - - 88
Ottomans - - 151
Orleans - - 58
Overyssel - - 49
Oviedo - - 96
Palestine - - 143
Paris - - 58
Parma - - 80
Parthia - - 129
Patans - - - 126
Pennsylvania - - 167
Persia - - 130
Peru - - - 172
Phœnicia - - 142
Phrygia - - 153
Piedmont - - 72
Pisa - - - 82
Placentia - - 80
Poland - - 39
Pontus - - 149
Popes - - 89
Portugal - *Page* 98
Provence - - 61
Prussia - - 41
Ptolemies - - 157
Rhodes - - 155
Romagna - - 83
Rome - - 84
Russia - - 35
St. John, Knights of - 155
Salerno - - 90
Sammanians - - 122
Saracens - - 128
Savoy - - 72
Scotland - - 23
Seleucidæ - - 140
Seljuks - - - 133
Servia - - 100
Siberia - - - 34
Sicily - - 92
Sienna - - 82
Sleswick - - 29
Soffarids - - 130
Sofis - - 134
Soissons - - 58
Spain - - 93
Sparta - - 111
Spoleto - - 83
Suevi - - 94
Sweden - - 31
Switzerland - - 70
Syria - - 140
Taherians - - 130
Tatary, Great - - 119
——— Little - 122
——— Eastern - 116
Teutonic knights - 41
Thessaly - - 109
Thibet - - 118
Thrace - - 103

Thuringians	*Page* 45	Urbino	*Page* 83
Timourids	123	Usbec Tatary	122
Tolunids	158	Utrecht	49
Trapezond	150	Vandals	161
Tripoli	161	Venice	74
Tunis	161	Virginia	168
Turks	151	Visigoths	57
Tuscany	81	Wales	27
Ukraine	38	Watâs	165
Umbria	83	Zeirids	162
United Provinces	51	Zutphen	49
—— States	167		

Works published by the same Author.

In One Volume Quarto, Price 16s.

THE DOCTRINE

OF

INTEREST AND ANNUITIES.

*** This work contains, 1° A completely new Analysis of the science and a variety of new Formulæ for the solution of the several cases connected with this subject, illustrated by numerous Examples. 2° The application of the doctrine to the several cases of Reversionary Annuities, the Purchasing of Leases in general, and the Renewal of Leases held under Colleges and other Corporate Bodies. 3° Observations on various questions relative to Finance; together with the method of applying this science to the investigation of the several schemes proposed for the Redemption of the National Debt. 4° The whole of Mr. Smart's Tables of Interest and Annuities, at the several rates of 2, 2½, 3, 3½, 4, 4½, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 per cent interest, calculated to eight places of decimals.

In Two Volumes Octavo, Price 25s.

THE DOCTRINE

OF

LIFE-ANNUITIES AND ASSURANCES.

*** This work contains, 1° A completely new Analysis of the science; wherein the errors of preceding authors are avoided, and (in general) more simple and correct Solutions are deduced. 2° A variety of Practical Questions to illustrate the use of the same; whereby it is rendered intelligible and useful to those who are unacquainted with mathematics. 3° Observations on the best schemes of providing annuities for Old Age and for Widows. 4° An account of the several Life-Assurance Companies established in London; with remarks on their respective merits and advantages. 5° A collection of all the Tables of Life-Annuities hitherto published in this country. 6° A review of the principal Writers on this subject; with critical remarks on their several performances. To which is *now* added, 7°,

AN APPENDIX,

Containing a paper read before the Royal Society on a *new method* of calculating and arranging Tables of Life-Annuities.

N.B. This Work is not complete without the APPENDIX; which is sold separately, price 4s.

Works published by the same Author, continued.

In One Volume Octavo, Third Edition, Price 6s.

TABLES

FOR

THE PURCHASING AND RENEWING

OF

LEASES.

*** The work contains, 1° A familiar introduction to Decimal Arithmetic. 2° The method of estimating the value of Leasehold Estates in general, both for Terms of Years certain and for Lives, together with several useful Tables for that purpose. 3° The Rules for determining the value of the Reversion of Estates after such Leases. 4° Tables and Rules for ascertaining the Fine that ought to be paid for the Renewal of Leases held for two and three Lives, or under Colleges and other Corporate Bodies.—The whole adapted to general use.

Second Edition, Price 1s.

AN ACCOUNT

Of the several LIFE-ASSURANCE COMPANIES

ESTABLISHED IN LONDON:

Containing a View of their respective Merits and Advantages.

[*continued*]

Works published by the same Author, continued.

In Two Volumes Octavo, Price 21s.

AN

EPITOME

OF

UNIVERSAL HISTORY,

ANCIENT AND MODERN,

FROM THE EARLIEST AUTHENTIC RECORDS TO THE PRESENT TIME.

*** This work is intended as an Accompaniment to the New Chart of History, and contains a Chronological abridgement of the most material events that have taken place in the several Empires, Kingdoms, and States, represented on the Chart. It is formed on the plan adopted by Dr. James Playfair in the second part of his excellent System of Chronology; and contains (besides a faithful narration of the circumstances above alluded to) some new Synoptical Tables of the principal Treaties between the different powers of Europe, from the peace of Westphalia to the present period; as well as several other interesting Tables tending to elucidate the connected sciences of History, Chronology, and Historical Geography.

PRINTED BY RICHARD AND ARTHUR TAYLOR, SHOE LANE, LONDON.

7883

H Baily, Francis
B1613d The description and use of a new chart of
history. Ed. 3.

University of Toronto
Library

DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED